Ī	1			
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA RICHMOND DIVISION			
3				
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)			
5	v.) Criminal Case No.:			
6) 3:19 CR 104 CHIKOSI LEGINS			
7	February 11, 2020 VOLUME IV			
9	TRANSCRIPT OF OPENING STATEMENTS, ALL TESTIMONY, AND CLOSING STATEMENTS OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID J. NOVAK UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
10				
11				
12	APPEARANCES:			
13	Thomas A. Garnett, Esquire OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 919 East Main Street, Suite 1900			
	Richmond, Virginia 23219			
15	Kathryn E. Gilbert, Esquire UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, 4025 NYA Washington, DC 20530			
17	Counsel on behalf of the United States			
18				
19	Charles A. Gavin, Esquire			
20	CAWTHORNE DESKEVICH & GAVIN PC 1409 Eastridge Road			
21	Richmond, Virginia 23229			
22	Counsel on behalf of the Defendant			
23				
24	TRACY J. STROH, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER			
25	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			

	1		2
1		INDEX	
2		WITNESSES	
3	Examinatio	n By:	Page
4		SARAH RAMSEY	
5	Direct Cross	- MR. GAVIN - MS. GILBERT JOHNNY LAVENDER	10 13
6	Direct	- MR. GAVIN MARK SCOTT	22
7 8	Cross	- MR. GAVIN - MR. GARNETT	26 30
Ö	Redirect	- MR. GAVIN RICHARD FORNASH	4 0
9	Cross	- MR. GAVIN - MR. GARNETT - MR. GAVIN	41 44 48
		AJIBOLA EROGBOGBO - MR. GAVIN	50
12		- MS. GILBERT - MR. GAVIN	56 71
	Direct Cross	KENNETH MIKIONIS - MR. GAVIN - MR. GARNETT	74 81
1415	Direct	DUANE FARMER - MR. GAVIN JEAN CHEEK, DNP, RN, BS, SANE-A, CN V	88
16		- MR. GAVIN - MS. GILBERT	91 98
	Redirect	- MR. GAVIN	101
18		EXHIBITS	
19	Exhibit	Description	Page
20	Defendant No. 17	Bureau of Prisons Health Services	13
21	NO. 17	Clinical Encounter	13
22			
23			
24			
25			

```
3
1
             (The proceeding reconvened at 9:27 a.m.)
2
             THE CLERK: Criminal matter 3:19 CR 104,
 3
   United States of America v. Chikosi Legins. Mr. Charles
   A. Gavin representing the defendant. Mr. Thomas A.
 5
   Garnett and Ms. Kathryn E. Gilbert representing the
   government.
 6
 7
             Counsel, are we ready to proceed?
8
             MR. GARNETT: The United States is ready,
9
   Your Honor.
             MR. GAVIN: The defense is ready, Your Honor.
10
             THE COURT: All right. I'm understanding the
11
   government is going to rest now. Is that what's going to
12
13
   happen?
             MR. GARNETT: That's correct, Your Honor.
14
15
             THE COURT: All right. Have you moved in all
   the exhibits and other evidence that you want to
16
17
   introduce?
18
             MR. GARNETT: We have, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to let you rest in
19
20
   front of the jury, but I thought we would just use this
21
   time right --
22
             MR. GARNETT: I'm sorry, Your Honor. My
23
   co-counsel corrected me. We do plan to offer the
  stipulations into evidence, as we discussed previously.
```

THE COURT: You want to publish them.

25

```
1
             MR. GARNETT: I'd publish them, Judge. I'd like
 2
   the jury to be able to take a copy back to the jury room.
 3
             THE COURT: I'm going to allow that.
             MR. GARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: But what I thought we ought to do is
 6
   have you publish them. So here's what we're going to do.
 7
   I'll bring the jury out in a second. I want to deal with
   whether or not they have any motions or not.
8
9
             I'll bring the jury out. You'll publish
10
   whatever remaining stipulations. I'll tell them they're
  going to get a copy of that going back, and then you can
11
12
   rest in front of the jury.
13
             MR. GARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Does that make sense?
14
             MR. GARNETT: Yes, sir.
15
16
             THE COURT: Okay. Then -- so, Mr. Gavin, do you
17
   have any motions at this time?
18
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, I'll have to make a motion
   under Rule 29.
19
20
             THE COURT: All right. That's going to be
21
            In my view, the government has presented
22
   overwhelming evidence of quilt.
23
             MR. GAVIN: As long as it's in the record.
             THE COURT: That's fine. It's denied.
24
```

Mr. Legins, do you want to rise?

25

24 All right. The government.

25

I think they're going to present some final

Prisons; (2) the alleged victim, B.L." -- Brandon 23 24 Lemagne -- "was a person within the Eastern District of Virginia, specifically, as a federal inmate confined to FCI Petersburg; and (3), the defendant, Chikosi Legins, was a federal correctional officer employed by the Bureau of Prisons at FCI Petersburg."

Stipulation number 9 addresses undisputed elements. "The parties jointly stipulate and agree that the following elements have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt: (1), the second element of Count Two, that the alleged offense was committed at a federal prison; (2) the second element, Counts Three and Four, that Brandon Lemagne was officially detained at FCI Petersburg; and (3) the third element of Count Five, that the defendant's statements to federal agents on June 5th, 2018, were made in a matter within the jurisdiction of the executive branch."

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you should accept those facts as proven just like all the other stipulations.

I'll tell you, the case is coming to an end here pretty quickly, and when you go back to deliberate, I'm going to give you the written stipulations so you'll have that back there with you with all the other evidence.

Lastly, you heard Mr. Garnett talk about elements of the offense. When I instruct you as to what the government's burden of proof is as to each one of the

crimes that have been alleged, they are going to be by elements. And so that's what he's talking about. You'll have those instructions with you, too, to figure out exactly what it is that you're deciding here. Okay? Does that make sense? All right.

Now, do you have any other evidence to offer?

MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor. The United States
rests.

THE COURT: All right.

So, ladies and gentlemen, now the government has concluded their case. We're going to switch over to the defense to see whether or not they have -- want to put on evidence. I'll remind you that the defendant never has any burden to offer any evidence. Of course, the defendant has no responsibility to testify, and if the defendant elects not to testify, you may not hold that against him in any way because that is his constitutional right to do so. Does everybody understand that? All right.

Mr. Gavin, do you have any evidence to offer?

MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GAVIN: Judge, the first issue would be another stipulation that was a joint stipulation.

THE COURT: That's fine.

```
1
             MR. GAVIN: It's number 7, which I'd like to
 2
   publish at this time.
 3
             THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.
             MR. GAVIN: Joint stipulation number 7. "The
 4
 5
   parties jointly stipulate and agree that on April 25,
   2018, defendant Chikosi Legins underwent a surgical
 6
 7
   procedure (a mandibulectomy) at the Virginia Commonwealth
   University (VCU) Medical Center. The defendant was
8
9
   discharged from VCU Medical Center on April 26, 2018."
10
             That's the end of that stipulation.
11
             THE COURT: Okay. You'll accept that as proven
12
   then, too, just like all other stipulations.
13
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, the United States and the
   defendant have also reached a stipulation as to testimony
14
15
   of his wife with regard to that picture that we discussed.
             THE COURT: The defendant's wife?
16
17
             MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir.
18
             THE COURT: That's fine.
             MR. GAVIN: So I'd like to read that stipulation
19
20
   of testimony, and it would be a stipulation of testimony
21
   that if Ms. Legins had been called as a witness, she would
22
   introduce a picture that she took of her husband's penis
   with a scale at full erection and that Mr. Legins' penis
23
  was measured at 7 inches in length.
24
25
             THE COURT: You should accept that as true.
```

```
10
                   Sarah Ramsey - Direct
   will tell you, they submitted a picture to me. I took a
1
 2
   look at it as well. We're going to spare you from taking
 3
   a look at the picture. You should accept this as true
   that a photograph of the defendant's penis would show that
 5
   fully elected, it would be approximately 7 inches long.
 6
   All right?
 7
             MR. GAVIN:
                          Sarah Ramsey.
8
             THE COURT: Is somebody getting Ms. Ramsey?
9
                          SARAH RAMSEY,
10
   called by the defendant, first being duly sworn, testified
11
                           as follows:
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
12
13
   BY MR. GAVIN:
        Good morning, Ms. Ramsey.
14
15
        Good morning.
        Could you state your name, please, and spell your
16
17
  name for the court reporter?
18
        Sarah Ramsey. S-A-R-A-H, R-A-M-S-E-Y.
19
        Ms. Ramsey, how are you employed?
20
        I'm a paramedic at the Federal Bureau of Prisons in
21 | Petersburg.
22
        Were you employed there on May 10th, 2018?
23
        Yes.
        Did you have occasion to see a gentleman by the name
24
      Brandon Lemagne?
```

```
11
                   Sarah Ramsey - Direct
1
        Yes.
2
        How did you come to see him?
 3
        I got a phone call -- I was in the medical
   department -- that an inmate was going to be brought to me
 5
   for a PREA case.
        And was he brought to you?
 6
 7
        Yes.
        And as part of your PREA examination, did you ask
8
  Mr. Lemagne about anything he may have done since he got
10
   to you?
11
        I did ask the inmate. You mean in reference to
12 like --
13
        Washing, cleaning.
        Yes. I did ask the inmate had he taken a shower, had
14
15 he had a bowel movement, had he eaten or drank anything.
        And did he answer all those questions?
16
17
       He did. He said he hadn't done anything.
18
        Okay. Did you take a report of exactly what he
  alleged to have happened?
19
20
        I took a short report. I didn't investigate or I
21 didn't ask in-detail questions. I was mainly focused on
22 his well-being, if he had any immediately life-threatening
   injuries. But once he told me what happened, I knew that
23
24 it was higher than my level of care.
        Okay. Ms. Ramsey, I'd like to show you something
```

```
12
                   Sarah Ramsey - Direct
1
  Ms. Brown is going to put on the screen.
2
             THE COURT: What exhibit?
 3
             MR. GAVIN: It's her report. It was previously
   authenticated. It's just the United States didn't
 4
 5
   introduce it because they decided not to call Ms. Ramsey.
             THE COURT: Well, that's fine. I still need to
6
 7
  know what number it is.
8
             MR. GAVIN: Seventeen.
9
             THE COURT: Okay.
10
             MR. GAVIN: Defendant's 17.
11
             THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any objection to
12
   this?
13
             MS. GILBERT: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. That's not a good
14
15
          I'm not seeing it. Okay. Can you all see it?
   sign.
  BY MR. GAVIN:
17
        Do you recognize that document, Ms. Ramsey?
18
       Yes.
19
        Is that the first page of your report?
20
        Yes.
21
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Brown, can you turn to the
22 second page of the report?
23 BY MR. GAVIN:
        Is that your assessment section?
24
        Yes.
```

```
13
                   Sarah Ramsey - Cross
1
        All right. I have underlined something in that
 2
   assessment section. That's not your underlining. But
 3
   could you read that to the jury?
        "He finished in me. He ejaculated in me."
 4
 5
        And you used an exclamation mark?
 6
        Yeah.
 7
        Do you have any doubt that that's what he told you
   when he gave you his version of what happened?
8
9
        No.
10
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, I'd like to move that as
   my 17.
11
12
             THE COURT: Okay. You said no objection, right?
13
             MS. GILBERT: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. It will be admitted.
14
15
             (Defendant Exhibit Number 17 was admitted.)
             MR. GAVIN: No other questions for Ms. Ramsey.
16
17
             THE COURT: Any questions?
18
             MS. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor.
19
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
20
   BY MS. GILBERT:
21
        Good morning, Ms. Ramsey.
22
        Good morning.
23
             MS. GILBERT: Your Honor, before I begin asking
  Ms. Ramsey questions, I'd just like to clarify with you.
   I'd like to ask her questions about the course of her
```

```
14
                   Sarah Ramsey - Cross
   entire examination of Brandon Lemagne because defense
1
 2
   counsel asked her about the examination. Is that
 3
   acceptable?
             THE COURT: Yeah. Of course.
 4
 5
   BY MS. GILBERT:
       Ms. Ramsey, we were just looking, just now, at your
 6
 7
  medical report from that night, May 10th, 2018. Excuse
  me. You said you were assessing Brandon Lemagne in the
8
  medical unit, correct?
10
        Yes.
        And when you first started speaking with Mr. Lemagne,
11
  nobody else was present; is that right?
12
        There was an officer that brought him to me, and I
13
  recall that he stayed in the hallway. And it was just
14
15
  Inmate Lemagne and myself in the medical room.
        Okay. And during the medical assessment, what were
16
17
   you doing with Brandon Lemagne?
        I was speaking with him. He wouldn't sit down.
18
                                                          So
  Lemagne was standing the entire time, and I asked him if
19
20
  it was okay if I sat down so I could look on the computer.
21
  And I checked his vital signs and just asked him if he had
22 linjuries and --
23
        Were you typing up all of your notes there while
  Brandon was talking, so far as you remember?
```

THE COURT: Mr. Lemagne?

25

```
15
                   Sarah Ramsey - Cross
1
             MS. GILBERT: I'm sorry.
 2
   BY MS. GILBERT:
 3
        While Mr. Lemagne was talking, so far as you
   remember?
 4
 5
        I always write their vitals on just a piece of paper.
  So I probably just wrote, like, name -- his name, his
 6
 7
  number, his vitals. I always ask what time did it happen.
  Write that down. Where did it happen. Write that down.
  Because I know what I have to plug into the report. So I
  just write those key things. And then I would have shred
11
  that paper. We have shredders everywhere.
12
        Okay. And then you typed it up later?
13
       And then I typed it up later.
       You said that Mr. Lemagne refused to sit down or
14
15
  didn't want to sit down. Did he say why he didn't want to
  sit down?
16
17
       He said he felt like there was something in him or --
18
  that's when he said, "He ejaculated in me." And he said,
   "It's in there. I feel like it's in there."
19
20
       Okay. Did you observe anything about Mr. Lemagne's
21 physical appearance during the examination?
       He wouldn't sit down. I mean, he seemed anxious.
22 A
23 And I remember he was wearing, like, a gray T-shirt, and
24 | it looked like the seam in the shoulder was ripped a
  little bit.
```

16 Sarah Ramsey - Cross 1 Why did that stick out to you? 2 Inmates aren't allowed to wear ripped clothing, and 3 if they have ripped clothing, we would investigate it that possibly they were assaulted or in some kind of fight. 4 5 So let's talk a little bit about what Mr. Lemagne 6 told you. Just briefly, what was the nature of his 7 allegation? He said that an officer raped him. And I immediately 8 just said, "Have you told the lieutenant the name of the 10 officer?" And he said yes. And I didn't know the name of the officer 11 immediately. I was just, you know, focused on the 12 13 inmate's well-being. So he said that he was a recreation orderly, that he went to Fox South. He was going to go to 14 every unit to hang flyers. He went to Fox South, hung a flyer and then asked to go to the unit next door and -- do 16 17 you want me to just keep going? 18 I'll ask you a question. 19 Sorry. Α 20 Thank you for jumping in. 21 **|**A I'm sorry. 22 0 So he said that he needed to go to the next unit to 23 continue hanging flyers. And what happened next? He said that Officer Legins let him through 24

the hallway.

```
17
                   Sarah Ramsey - Cross
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, I would object only because
1
 2
   this is way beyond the scope of my examination.
3
             THE COURT: No. You opened the door. I'm going
   to let her do what she needs to do.
 4
 5
             MR. GAVIN: Okay.
        I believe by that time, he might have said the
 6
 7
  officer's name that led him through the door or he may
  not. He just said --
8
  BY MS. GILBERT:
9
10
       Did he -- I'm sorry to interrupt you, Ms. Ramsey.
  Did he, at some point, tell you what officer had sexually
11
12 | assaulted him?
        It probably wasn't until I got the phone call.
13
        Okay. And we'll get to the phone call in a moment.
14
15 So I'm sorry. So he said that an officer was taking him
  between the units; is that right?
16
17
   Α
        Uh-huh.
18
        In the hallway area there in F-South. And what did
  he say that the officer did after he took him between the
19
20 units?
21 A
       He said, He grabbed me. He pulled me against him.
22 He said, He, like, grabbed me by the butt, like, he was
23 holding me. And he mentioned, like, he was rough. And
24 In then he said he forced him to perform oral, and then he
25 said he turned him around forcefully. And he said that he
```

18 Sarah Ramsey - Cross 1 heard him, like, spit or something, and he penetrated him. 2 Did Mr. Lemagne say whether this was consensual? 3 He said that it was rape, but he didn't use the word consensual or nonconsensual. 4 5 Okay. Do you remember whether Mr. Lemagne reported 6 any physical sensations? 7 I'm not sure what you mean. 8 Did he report any pain to you? 9 Oh, yes. I asked if he was in any pain, and he said 10 that he was just sore, that his anus was sore. 11 Do you remember what rating Mr. Lemagne gave his pain 12 on the pain scale? 13 I just briefly saw it, and it was 6 on that report. That's a scale out of 10, right? 14 15 Uh-huh. So also as part of your medical assessment, you took 16 Mr. Lemagne's blood pressure, correct? 17 18 Yes. And do you recall what his blood pressure was? 19 20 can pull up your report for you, too, if you don't recall. 21 No, I don't recall. I remember it was slightly 22 elevated. 23 Okay. You mentioned earlier that there was a call 24 Ithat you received. Can you please explain what the call

was that you received during the examination?

19 Sarah Ramsey - Cross Lemagne was standing kind of like beside me. I was 1 2 sitting in the chair writing either his vitals or what he was telling me. I was logged in. I was probably starting 3 to type it into the report. And I have a radio I wear at 5 all times, and I heard across the radio, "Fox South to medical." And I say, "Go for medical." And they said, 6 7 "Phone extension." And the phone in front of me was 1121. So I said, "1121." And then --8 9 And if I could just pause you there, Ms. Ramsey. So was it the case that someone was raising to you and asking 11 you what your telephone extension was in the medical unit? 12 Yes. 13 So you gave your telephone extension. Uh-huh. 14 15 And what happened next? A few seconds later, that phone rang. And in those 16 few seconds, Lemagne was getting like antsy, and he said, 17 "That's him. That's him. That's the one. He's the one 18 19 that raped me." And I was like, "Okay. Calm down. Don't say 20 21 Manything." 22 What did -- what did the person on the phone say to 23 you? I answered the phone, and I always identify myself, 24

and I said, "Medical, this is Ramsey."

```
20
                    Sarah Ramsey - Cross
             And the person on the phone said, "Hey, this is
1
 2
           I'm in Fox South. And I just had a major surgery
   Legins.
3
   on my neck, and I forgot my two medicines at home and --
             And I said, "Okay. I'm sorry. We don't treat
 4
 5
   staff."
 6
             And the person was like, "Oh, you don't treat
 7
   staff?"
8
             And I was like, "No."
9
        So he repeated his question back to you?
10
        Yeah. It was --
        The way that you were just talking right now was
11
   quite slowly. Was the person on the phone speaking slowly
12
13
  to you?
14
        Yes.
15
        What was your impression of -- I won't ask you that.
             You do not treat officers in the medical unit,
16
17
   correct?
18
        Only in life-threatening cases, if they're bleeding
   or unresponsive or something.
19
20
   Q
        Other than that, you just treat inmates?
21 A
        Correct.
22 Q
        So you don't hand out pain medication to officers,
23 right?
24 A
        No.
        Did the defendant just end the call after you
```

```
21
                   Sarah Ramsey - Cross
   asked -- after you answered his questions?
1
        I just remember there being an awkward pause, and I
2
3
   was like -- I don't -- I don't recall how it ended. I
   probably said "okay" and hung up, but --
 4
 5
        Fair to say he was lingering on the line?
       It felt like that, and I didn't know what to say.
 6
 7
   So --
        In your experience as a correctional officer, was
8
   that call unusual to you?
10
        Yes, because that person rarely calls me. I don't
  recall him ever calling me, and the fact that the inmate
11
   said, "That is the person that raped me," they called at
12
13
   that time.
14
             MS. GILBERT: Thank you, Ms. Ramsey.
15
             THE COURT: Any redirect?
             MR. GAVIN: Your Honor, I don't have any
16
17
   redirect. I'd ask Ms. Ramsey be excused.
18
             THE COURT:
                         Yeah.
             Ms. Ramsey, thank you for your testimony. You
19
20
   can be excused. I would ask you not to talk about your
21
   testimony with anybody until our trial is over. Okay?
22
   Thank you again for being here.
23
             (Witness stood aside.)
             MR. GAVIN: Next witness, Bruce Norman.
24
25
             CSO SPIVEY: Mr. Gavin, there's no Bruce Norman.
```

```
22
                  Johnny Lavender - Direct
1
             MR. GAVIN: No Bruce Norman.
2
             THE COURT: Well, do you want to go out and
 3
   look?
 4
             MR. GAVIN: I'll go to somebody else.
 5
             THE COURT: Okay.
 6
             MR. GAVIN: Mr. Lavender.
 7
             THE COURT: Agent Lavender, for the third time,
8
   you're going to hit the witness stand. Go ahead.
9
             SPECIAL AGENT LAVENDER: Yes, sir.
10
             THE COURT: Agent Lavender, you can have a seat.
   You remain under oath. You've been put under oath before.
11
12
   I will just ask you to state your full name again for the
13
   record.
14
             SPECIAL AGENT LAVENDER: Yes, Your Honor.
15
   Johnny Lavender, L-A-V-E-N-D-E-R.
                         JOHNNY LAVENDER,
16
17
    called by the defendant, having been previously sworn,
18
                      testified as follows:
19
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
20
   BY MR. GAVIN:
21
        Good morning, Special Agent Lavender.
22
        Good morning, sir.
23
        I think we developed that you're the case agent
   that's in charge of this investigation?
        Yes, sir.
```

```
23
                 Johnny Lavender - Direct
1
        All right. At my request, did I ask you to produce
 2
   the commissary records for Mr. Lemagne's roommate?
 3
        Yes, you did.
        And what was the name of that roommate?
 4
 5
       Ronzell Jackson.
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Brown, I'd ask you to introduce
 6
 7
  what's already been admitted as Defense Exhibit 5.
  BY MR. GAVIN:
8
9
        Is that the commissary report for Mr. Jackson?
10
        I see a registration number listed. It does not have
  Mr. Jackson's name listed, but it appears to be the
11
12 report.
13
        Do you see any cleats that were ordered by
  Mr. Jackson in the month of February 2018?
14
15
       I see -- you're asking me do I see any cleats
  ordered?
16
17
        Yeah. Or is there any record on the commissary
18 report of cleats being ordered by Mr. Jackson during the
  month of February 2018?
19
20
       Sir, when I produced this report, I got on the
21 Internet and looked up some of these shoes, and under
22 oath, I can tell you -- I can't tell you if any of these
  shoes were or were not cleats by the description and by
23
24 the pictures that I pulled up.
       Let me ask you another question. Is there anything
```

```
24
                  Johnny Lavender - Direct
   ordered in the month of February 2018?
1
 2
        Yes, sir.
 3
        And what is that?
        According to what I'm seeing on 2/12/2018, I see a
 4
 5
   SanDisk Clip Sport.
        So that would not have been on either February 17th
 6
 7
   or February 19th; is that correct?
        According to the document, it says 2/12 of 2018.
8
9
        When you Googled and researched this, did you Google
10
  SanDisk Clip Sport?
        We did, I believe.
11
12
        And is that a pair of shoes?
13
        I can't recall at this time what the picture was.
        Does it have anything related, to your recollection,
14
15
   to do with music?
        The SanDisk Clip Sport?
16
17
        Yes, sir.
18
        I don't recall.
19
             MR. GAVIN: I don't have any other questions,
20
   Judge.
21
             THE COURT: Do you have any questions?
22
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
23
             THE COURT: All right, Agent. You can step
          Thank you for your testimony. The same rules
24
   down.
   continue to apply.
```

```
1
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
2
             (Witness stood aside.)
 3
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, I'd like to call Mark Scott.
   He's an inmate in the back.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Mr. Scott.
             Mr. Gavin, can you just give me a general idea
 6
 7
  how much longer you're talking about? I'm not going to
   hold you to it, but can you give me an idea?
9
             MR. GAVIN: This witness will be very short.
10
             THE COURT: But after this witness?
11
             MR. GAVIN: I have several other short
12
   witnesses.
13
             THE COURT: Okay. So you're thinking you're
   going to be wrapped up in an hour?
14
15
             MR. GAVIN: A little bit more than an hour.
16
  Probably an hour and a half.
17
             THE COURT: All right.
18
             Folks, we are in a position of being able to
   order lunch for you today if you didn't bring your lunch.
19
  Does anybody want to do that? Now is not the time to be
21
   shy. Raise your hand if you want us to order lunch.
22
             Okay. I'll tell you what we're going to do is
   when we -- we'll take a break here before 11:00, and we'll
23
   get your order for lunch. As you can see, we're moving
   pretty quickly. This case is going to come to you today.
```

```
26
                    Mark Scott - Direct
1
   We're going to be a little bit chopped up on our breaks a
 2
   little bit because there's some legal things I have to do
 3
   with the lawyers, but we're going to -- the case is going
   to be in your hands at some point today. Okay?
 5
   All right.
6
                           MARK SCOTT,
 7
  called by the defendant, first being duly sworn, testified
8
                           as follows:
9
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
10
   BY MR. GAVIN:
        Good morning, Mr. Scott.
11
12
        Good morning.
13
        Mr. Scott, could you state your name for the record
14
   and spell your name for the court reporter?
15
        Mark -- Mark Haywood Scott. M-A-R-K, H-A-Y-W-O-O-D,
  S-C-O-T-T.
16
17
        Mr. Scott, are you currently an inmate at Petersburg
18
  Medium?
19
        Yes, sir.
   Α
20
        Were you an inmate on May 10th, 2018?
21 A
        Yes, sir.
22 Q
        Where were you housed?
23
        F-South.
        Is that Fox South?
24
        Fox South. F-South. Fox South.
```

```
27
                    Mark Scott - Direct
1
        All right. Were you in the common area?
2
        I was coming into the unit, but that's where I'm
 3
   housed at.
        Okay. All right. I'll show you a video. Okay?
 4
                                                            And
 5
   I want to see if you -- do you remember us talking at
   Petersburg?
 6
 7
        Yes.
8
        All right. And I was unable to really show you a
   true video because I couldn't bring in a computer,
10
   correct?
11
        Correct.
12
        All right. So I'm going to ask you to look at the
13
   video and identify yourself in this video. Okay?
14
        Okay.
15
        It's going to be on your screen.
             (Video Played.)
16
17
             MS. TAYLOR: Is this right?
18
             MR. GAVIN: Yeah. You can let it play.
19
             (Video Played.)
20
   BY MR. GAVIN:
21
        Do you recognize yourself yet in this video?
22
        It seem like that's me right there with the coat.
23
        All right. Can you put your finger on that screen
   and circle it?
24
        Let me see.
```

```
28
                    Mark Scott - Direct
1
             MR. GAVIN: Can you stop it, Ms. Taylor?
2
   BY MR. GAVIN:
3
        Can you circle where you are in the coat?
             CSO SPIVEY: Touch the screen, yeah.
 4
 5
   BY MR. GAVIN:
6
        Right there?
 7
             CSO SPIVEY: Touch the screen. It will circle
8
   it.
9
        Yeah, at the desk.
10
   Q
        All right.
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Taylor, could you let it play?
11
12
              (Video Played.)
13
             MR. GAVIN: Could you stop it right there,
  Ms. Taylor?
14
15
  BY MR. GAVIN:
        All right. Mr. -- Mr. Scott, that shows you walking
16
17
   towards the back, and there's an officer in front of you.
18 Do you recognize who that officer was?
19
   Α
        Yes.
20
   Q
        Who was that?
21 A
        Officer Legins.
22
   0
        Okay.
23
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Taylor, could you let it play?
24
              (Video Played.)
25
             MR. GAVIN: Can you stop it right there,
```

```
29
                    Mark Scott - Direct
1
  Ms. Taylor?
 2
   BY MR. GAVIN:
 3
       All right. At that point in time, where did
   Officer Legins go?
 5
        He went where the counselors and case manager's
   office at.
 6
 7
        And do you know Mr. Lemagne?
8
  Α
        Yes.
9
       Was he in that -- did he go through that same door as
10 | well?
11
  Α
        Yes.
12 Q
        Were you right there in a position where you could
13 see through the two windows that was --
        Yes, because you could see --
14
  Α
15
        -- in the doors?
   Q
        -- you could see right through the glass --
16
17
   Q
        Okay.
18
        -- two glasses.
19
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Taylor, could you let it a play
20
  a few minutes -- or a few seconds longer?
21
             (Video Played.)
22
             MR. GAVIN: All right. Can you stop,
23
  Ms. Taylor?
24 BY MR. GAVIN:
        All right. So you were there for several seconds,
```

```
30
                    Mark Scott - Cross
1
   right?
2
        Right.
 3
        And were you seeing what was happening in that
   corridor?
 4
 5
        I seen them going straight -- going, like, straight
   across to the other side. Because Mr. Lemagne, he came
 7
   in, and he always put up the flyers for, like, the events
   that we have.
8
        Did you see them entering the office that's off of
9
   that corridor where the secretary sits?
11
        No, I didn't.
12
             MR. GAVIN: All right. I have no other
13
   questions.
             THE COURT: Go ahead.
14
15
             MR. GARNETT:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
16
17
   BY MR. GARNETT:
18
        Good morning, Mr. Scott.
19
        Good morning.
20
        Mr. Scott, just like you and Mr. Gavin, we also spoke
21 down at FCI Petersburg not too long ago; isn't that right?
22
        That's correct.
23
        Okay. And at no point during that discussion did you
24 mention anything about observing through the windows,
  watching the defendant walk towards the other end of that
```

```
31
                    Mark Scott - Cross
1
  hallway, did you?
 2
        No, I didn't. I just -- I just be looking through
 3
   there. Because I'm trying to go to the computer, but so
  many people on the computer.
 4
 5
        And prior to that, you spoke to federal agents,
 6
   didn't you?
 7
        Yes. One.
8
        Okay. And at no point during that interview did you
   say anything about observing through the windows of that
10
   unit team corridor doorway, did you?
        I don't think so.
11
12
        That didn't seem relevant to you, that you were
   watching the defendant go in through a corridor?
13
        I mean, I seen him go in. I seem him walk.
14
15
   turned around because I'm minding my own business because
  I'm trying to use the computer, but so many people on the
16
   computers, I just turned around.
17
18
        Okay. When we talked a couple of weeks ago,
  Mr. Scott, we walked through what you described as sort of
19
20
  a timeline of what you saw that day; isn't that right?
21
        Correct.
22
        Okay. And you said that you had observed Brandon
23 Lemagne enter Fox South that unit -- that evening,
24 | followed by Officer Legins; isn't that right?
```

Correct.

```
32
                    Mark Scott - Cross
1
        And you watched Brandon Lemagne go to hang flyers,
 2
   right?
 3
        Correct.
        You said you watched Officer Legins go into his
 4
 5
   office?
 6
        Correct.
 7
        You said that you watched Brandon Lemagne enter
   Officer Legins' office and ask for permission to use the
8
   unit team corridor; isn't that right?
10
       He asked -- he asking -- say he want to get to the
11
  other side.
12
        Okay. He went into the office to ask him that?
13
       He went to the door, at the doorway. He went to the
  doorway, and he wanted to go into the other side because
14
   that's the way the officers take them. They just take
  them to the other side and let them out on the other side
17
   and come back.
18
        All right. But you said Brandon Lemagne was standing
   in the doorway to ask him this question, right?
19
20
        Yeah. He came to the door.
21 Q
        And then Officer Legins got up and walked him through
22 the corridor?
23
        Yes.
24
   Q
        Okay.
25
             MR. GARNETT: Ms. Taylor, can we go ahead and go
```

```
33
                    Mark Scott - Cross
   back to that same clip, Government Exhibit 2? Around the
1
 2
   18:10 time stamp.
 3
              (Video Played.)
             THE COURT: When you get to where you want to
 4
 5
   go, put the time stamp on the record. Okay?
6
             MR. GARNETT: You can stop right there,
7
   Ms. Taylor.
8
             Okay. The time stamp, Your Honor, is 18:09:32
9
   at the top left hard corner there.
10
             THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
11
              (Video Played.)
12
             MR. GARNETT: Okay. Ms. Taylor -- actually, let
13
  me stop right there, Ms. Taylor.
  BY MR. GARNETT:
14
15
        So, Mr. Scott, at this point Brandon Lemagne has
   entered. It appears Officer Legins is about to enter his
16
17
   office. Is that accurate?
18
        Correct.
19
        Okay.
20
             MR. GARNETT: Ms. Taylor, can you please play?
21
             (Video Played.)
22
             MR. GARNETT: You can stop right there,
23
  Ms. Taylor.
  BY MR. GARNETT:
        So, Mr. Scott, when I'm watching that video, I
```

```
34
                    Mark Scott - Cross
   don't see Brandon Lemagne approaching --
1
2
             THE COURT: You're not testifying. Just ask
 3
   him.
 4
             MR. GARNETT: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
 5
             THE COURT: That's okay.
 6
   BY MR. GARNETT:
 7
        Mr. Scott, do you see Brandon Lemagne walk into that
8
   office?
9
        No.
10
        Do you see him up front?
11
       He at the corner. He at the corner.
12 Q
        He's in the corner, right. Did you see him standing
13 in the doorway?
14
        No.
15
        Okay. So is it possible that your recollection of
  that evening might not be that strong?
17
        It might not be, but --
18
        All right. Now, you earlier said that you didn't
   think -- I think you said that you thought Brandon Lemagne
19
20
  and Officer Legins were in the corridor for one or two
21 minutes; isn't that right?
22 A
       Correct.
23
        Okay. Were you wearing a watch at that time?
24
        No.
        Is there a clock you were observing?
```

```
35
                    Mark Scott - Cross
1
        No.
2
        Okay.
 3
             MR. GARNETT: Ms. Taylor, can you please go
   ahead and advance it to 18:15, please, or thereabouts.
 4
 5
             (Video Played.)
 6
             MR. GARNETT: That's great, Ms. Taylor.
 7
   you. You can stop right there, Ms. Taylor.
  BY MR. GARNETT:
8
9
        So, Mr. Scott, the jury has already seen this video
   so I'm not going to make them rewatch it. Will you take
  my word for it -- this is already in evidence -- that it's
11
   now 18:14:58 on the time stamp, and neither Officer Legins
12
13
  or Brandon Lemagne has reemerged from that unit team
   corridor?
14
15
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, he can't testify to that.
16
  He --
17
             MR. GARNETT: I'm asking if he's willing to
  accept that, Your Honor.
18
19
             THE COURT: Say that again.
20
             MR. GAVIN: He can't --
21
             THE COURT: Hold on one second.
22
             Officer Spivey, can you see why all those people
23
   are outside of that door? I was distracted by -- we've
   got a line of people out there, and you'll reask the
   question.
```

```
36
                    Mark Scott - Cross
1
             MR. GARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.
2
             THE COURT: It looks like they're a bunch of
 3
   students. All right.
             Mr. Garnett, I'm sorry. I owe you an apology
 4
 5
   because I was distracted. Would you --
6
             MR. GARNETT: So, Your Honor, what I'm trying to
 7
   avoid doing is playing the entire video for the duration
   of Mr. Scott's time on the stand.
8
9
             THE COURT: Just -- I didn't pick up the
10
   question --
11
             MR. GARNETT: Sure.
12
             THE COURT: -- because I was wondering why we
  had all these people out there.
             MR. GARNETT: Yes, Your Honor.
14
15
             THE COURT: Tell me what the question is again.
             MR. GARNETT: Sure. I'm asking Mr. Scott,
16
17
   Your Honor, whether he's willing to accept my proffer that
18
  \blacksquareat no time between the start at 18:10:05 and now,
   18:14:58, has either the defendant or Brandon Lemagne
19
20
  reemerged from that set of doorways.
21
             THE COURT: You can't say your proffer. You can
  say do you agree that the tape shows the following.
23
             MR. GARNETT: Well, I don't know if he can,
  Your Honor. That's why --
25
             THE COURT: Well, then you can't ask your
```

```
37
                    Mark Scott - Cross
1
   question.
2
             MR. GARNETT: Okay. Your Honor, then I'd ask to
3
   go ahead and play the videotape.
 4
             THE COURT: That's fine.
 5
             MR. GARNETT: Okay.
             Ms. Taylor, if you can go back to the beginning
6
 7
   of that, please.
8
             MS. TAYLOR: Starting?
9
             MR. GARNETT: 18:10:04, or thereabouts.
10
             (Video Played.)
             MR. GARNETT: That's fine.
11
12
             THE COURT: You started playing at what number?
13
             MR. GARNETT: I believe we started at 18:09:55,
   Your Honor.
14
15
             THE COURT: Okay.
              (Video Played.)
16
17
             MR. GARNETT: And if we could pause it right
18
   there, Ms. Taylor.
   BY MR. GARNETT:
19
20
        So, Mr. Scott, the time on that stamp is now 18:10
   and 10 seconds; is that right?
22
        Correct.
23
             MR. GARNETT: Okay. You can go ahead and play
  lit, Ms. Taylor.
25
              (Video Played.)
```

```
38
                    Mark Scott - Cross
   BY MR. GARNETT:
1
2
        And just to be clear, Mr. Scott, your testimony was
 3
   one or two minutes; isn't that right? Or I'm sorry. Your
   earlier statement was one or two minutes?
 4
 5
        Yes.
              (Video Played.)
 6
 7
             THE COURT: All right. How much longer do you
8
   want to do?
9
             MR. GARNETT: I just want to go back to that
10
   same side, Your Honor.
             So we can fast-forward a little bit, Ms. Taylor.
11
12
              (Video Played.)
13
             MR. GARNETT: A little bit more.
             (Video Played.)
14
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, I'll stipulate that the time
15
   was 5 minutes and 13 seconds, if that's what they're
16
17
   trying to get to.
18
             MR. GARNETT: Go ahead and play that.
19
             THE COURT: I think he has a question, though,
20
   about that in the meantime.
21
             MR. GARNETT: I do. Thank you.
22
             Go ahead, Ms. Taylor.
23
             MS. TAYLOR: I'm sorry?
24
             MR. GARNETT: You can hit play.
25
             (Video Played.)
```

```
39
                    Mark Scott - Cross
1
             MR. GARNETT: And you can pause it right there,
 2
   Ms. Taylor.
 3
   BY MR. GARNETT:
        So, Mr. Scott, is that Officer Legins reentering
 4
 5
   Fox South?
 6
        Yes.
 7
        Okay. And where are you, Mr. Scott? Are you down
   there in the left-hand side of the screen leaning on that
9
  blue contraption?
10
        What, this?
        Can you circle yourself, please?
11
12
        Where the blue podium at?
13
        Yes. Can you please circle yourself with your
  finger?
14
15
        I don't think that's me.
        Where do you think you are? Do you believe you're
16
17
  leaning on that blue podium, Mr. Scott, on the far
  left-hand side?
18
19
        No.
             That's ain't me. I probably was in my cell.
20
  probably went to my cell.
21
        Okay. That's not you?
   Q
22 A
        Not right here, not leaning.
23
        The individual wearing a sweater and a hat is not
24 you?
        This here is a regular shirt.
```

40 Mark Scott - Redirect Okay. 1 2 I had on my coat. 3 Would you agree with me that the difference -- the time difference between when the defendant entered the 5 unit team corridor and when he emerged was more than five minutes? 6 7 Well, the tape said he did. So I guess so. 8 Mr. Scott, you earlier, when speaking to federal agents, said that you had observed Officer Legins, the defendant, shortly after this; isn't that right? 11 I seen -- I seen Legins come back out. 12 Okay. Did you see Officer Legins sitting in his 13 office shortly after this? 14 Yeah. 15 And what did you say that Officer Legins' demeanor was at this pint? 17 I mean, he were just sitting there. And then I guess 18 he had got a call or something because he put his head down. He ain't look like hisself. 19 20 I think you -- did you say he looked very sad? 21 He looked like something was wrong, like something 22 wrong at home or something. 23 MR. GARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Any redirect? 24 25 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

```
41
                 Richard Fornash - Direct
1
   BY MR. GAVIN:
2
        Mr. Scott, did the FBI ask you what you observed down
3
   that hallway?
       He asked me did I -- did I see -- see them go across.
 4
 5
   I said I seen them go in there and go straight across.
        All right. So you're sight was limited, though, to
 6
 7
   the amount of time that you were there at those doors,
   correct?
8
9
        Correct.
10
             MR. GAVIN: I don't have any other questions.
             THE COURT: All right, Mr. Scott. Thank you for
11
   your testimony. I'm going to instruct you not to talk
12
13
   about your testimony with anybody until our trial is over.
   Okay?
14
15
             THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. You can be excused.
16
17
   Thank you.
18
             THE WITNESS: Thank you.
19
             (Witness stood aside.)
20
             MR. GAVIN: Richard Fornash, Your Honor.
21
                         RICHARD FORNASH,
  called by the defendant, first being duly sworn, testified
23
                           as follows:
24
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
   BY MR. GAVIN:
```

```
42
                 Richard Fornash - Direct
1
        Good morning, Mr. Fornash.
 2
        Good morning.
        Could you state your name, please, for the record and
 3
   then spell it?
 4
 5
        Richard Fornash. R-I-C-H-A-R-D. Fornash is
 6
  F-O-R-N-A-S-H.
 7
        Mr. Fornash, are you currently an inmate at
  Petersburg Medium?
8
9
        I am.
10
        Were you an inmate on or around March of 2018?
11
        Yes.
12 Q
       Are you part of the LGBT community?
13 A
       I am transgender, yes.
        All right. Are you familiar with another inmate
14
15 named Brandon Lemagne?
16
        Yes.
17
        Does the transgender community sort of hang out
18 together?
        They hang out together. So do -- well, everybody,
19
  the whole LGBT, for the most part.
20
21
        And was it an occasion where you guys were hanging
22 out sort of on or around March of 2018 around a softball
23 diamond?
24 A
        We hung out around the softball diamond a few times.
  I can't tell you exact dates at this point. It's been two
```

```
43
                 Richard Fornash - Direct
1
   years.
2
              Do you recall ever overhearing a conversation
        Okay.
 3
   or being part of a conversation with Mr. Lemagne when the
   subject was pat-downs by officers?
 4
 5
        Yes.
 6
        Did Mr. Lemagne say anything about what he would do
 7
   if given the opportunity with improperly patted down?
        Not if improperly patted down, no.
8
        What kind of comments did he make? Did he make any
9
   comments to you about setting up police officers?
        He said if he had a chance to have sexual
11
   relationships with a police officer, he would so that he
12
13
   could use that, you know, for other means.
        All right. And that was something that was out of
14
15
  his mouth?
16
        Yes.
17
        All right. When you heard what had allegedly
18
  happened with Mr. Legins, did you come forward?
        I had -- I mentioned something to the guard working
19
20
  my unit, because I didn't know if it was true or not. But
21
   I didn't know if -- we had heard something had happened.
22 We didn't know details. So I brought something up.
  Because after that comment, it seemed weird that, if the
23
24 Trumors were true, that Legins had been arrested.
        So why did you believe that you needed to come
```

```
44
                  Richard Fornash - Cross
1
   forward with that comment?
 2
        Because the comment happened like a week before, or
 3
   so, before -- apparently the rumor was the FBI showed up
   and started pulling people out.
 4
 5
        Did you think you'd get any reward or any reduction
   in your sentence if you came forward?
 6
 7
        No.
8
                          I don't have any other questions.
             MR. GAVIN:
9
             THE COURT: Any cross?
10
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
11
   BY MR. GARNETT:
12
        Good morning, Mr. Fornash.
13
        Good morning.
14
        Mr. Fornash, you testified before a federal grand
15
   jury in Richmond on May 8th of 2019; is that right?
16
        Yes.
17
        And during that time, there was a court reporter
  present who transcribed your testimony?
18
19
   Α
        Yes.
20
        Okay. And you were under oath at that time?
21
  Α
        Yes.
22 0
        Okay. Before we go too much further, I want to ask
   you about your criminal convictions, Mr. Fornash.
23
   you convicted of production of child pornography in 2014?
        I was.
```

1 Q Now, in regards to Brandon Lemagne, this case, just

2 to be clear at the outset here, you have no idea of what

3 actually happened in Fox South on May 10th of 2018, do

4 you?

7

9

5 A I -- as I said, I was not there. I did not see

6 anything. I do not know what happened. All I know, that

there was a coincidental timing of what I heard said and

8 what happened.

Q And you haven't talked to the defendant, Officer

O Chikosi Legins, about that evening?

11 A I have not.

12 Q You've never talked about this after May 10th with

13 Brandon Lemagne?

14 A That situation -- no. That situation -- or that

15 comment thing had never been brought up again after that,

16 no.

17 Q So, Mr. Fornash, you were talking about the -- sort

18 of the social setting in which the comment was made.

19 You'd acknowledge that you were not particularly close

20 with Brandon Lemagne; isn't that right?

21 A Correct.

22 Q All right. You'd acknowledge you only knew him

23 because you were sort of in the same general social circle

24 | in prison?

5 A Correct.

Richard Fornash - Cross

46

1 Q You didn't share close personal details of your life 2 with him?

- A Correct. And he did not share with me.
- 4 Q Is it fair to say that your conversations with
- Brandon Lemagne were just sort of casual prison gossip?
- 6 A It was exactly prison gossip. Like I said, the
- 7 comment that was made about -- what I repeated about, you
- 8 know, Lemagne saying that they would sleep with a guard.
- 9 It's the same as two people standing at the water cooler
- 10 or talking about if they won the lottery.
- 11 Q So let's talk a little bit about that briefly, then.
- 12 Is this the kind of comment -- comment about setting up a
- 13 guard, is that the kind of comment you'd heard frequently
- 14 in this kind of social setting?
- 15 A I've probably heard it about three or four times in
- 16 the last seven years.

3

- 17 Q So it was not an unusual thing for inmates to banter about?
- 19 A The only thing that made it unusual was the timing.
- 20 Q Now, Mr. Fornash, you would agree that if an inmate
- 21 was planning to set up a federal correctional officer, he
- 22 could face serious consequences if it was discovered that
- 23 he was lying?
- 24 A That's correct.
- 25 Q And you'd agree that sort of a general fact of prison

Case 3:19-cr-00104-DJN Document 138 Filed 02/27/20 Page 47 of 183 PageID# 1403 47 Richard Fornash - Cross life, that the more people know about something, the more 1 2 likely it is to become public knowledge? 3 Yeah. You can't keep a secret in prison. Is it fair to say that most inmates are looking to 4 5 collect information they can use to try to reduce their sentence? 6 7 Some are. And are those inmates eager to report the information 8 they get to law enforcement? 10 If they're looking for a reward, yes. Now, would you agree as well, Mr. Fornash, that if 11 you had an inmate -- an inmate announcing that he had a 12 13 plan to frame a correctional officer would be something that -- if overheard, would be something that a lot of 14 15 inmates would be eager to pass on to authorities? I wouldn't say a lot, but there would be inmates 16 that -- certain ones that would, yes. 17 18 And if you're planning to set up a plot to frame a correctional officer, it wouldn't make much sense to sort 19 20 of casually announce that plan the week prior in a social 21 circle, would it?

22 Α No.

23

And because that would be valuable information to law 24 enforcement, you'd think that if it was in a general social setting, there would be other people to come

```
48
                Richard Fornash - Redirect
   forward and report this to law enforcement?
1
        As long as they didn't want to be labeled a snitch.
 2
 3
        What if they wanted to receive time off their
   sentence?
 4
 5
        Then, yes, they would.
        Now, Mr. Fornash, it has been approximately 20
 6
 7
  months -- I'm careful with math as I stand here. But if
  Brandon Lemagne had been serious about the statement he
  made to you in this sort of social circle, you'd agree
   that if he was serious, he should have filed a lawsuit by
  now looking for damages; is that right?
11
12
        Right.
13
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, that would require
14
   speculation.
15
             THE COURT: Yeah. Let's not do that.
             MR. GARNETT: All right.
16
17
             THE COURT: That's going to be stricken.
18
             MR. GARNETT: Understood, Your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: Do you have anything else?
20
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
21
             THE COURT: Do you have any redirect?
                      REDIRECT EXAMINATION
22
23
   BY MR. GAVIN:
        Mr. Fornash, do you know a gentleman by the name of
24
   Ronzell Jackson?
```

```
49
                Richard Fornash - Redirect
1
        Do they have a nickname?
 2
        Zell.
3
        Yes.
             MR. GARNETT: Your Honor, this is beyond the
 4
 5
   scope of my cross.
 6
             MR. GAVIN: Well, he wanted to know who was
 7
   around these conversations and whether it was a general
8
   conversation.
9
             MR. GARNETT: I did not, Your Honor. I asked if
10
   anyone else -- I asked if whether he thought people would
11
   come forward if they were present.
12
             THE COURT: Well, no. You asked some questions
13
   about who else was there. Go ahead.
  BY MR. GAVIN:
14
15
        Was Zell part of that conversation?
16
        No.
17
        He was not?
18
        He was not there, no.
19
             MR. GAVIN: Okay. No other questions.
20
             THE COURT: All for nothing. Okay.
21
             Sir, thank you for your testimony. You can step
22
          I'm going to instruct you that you're not to talk
23
   about your testimony with anybody until our trial is over.
         Thank you again for your testimony.
   Okay?
25
              (Witness stood aside.)
```

```
50
                Ajibola Erogbogbo - Direct
1
             MR. GAVIN: Keep going?
 2
             THE COURT: What's that?
 3
             MR. GAVIN: Do you want to keep going or --
 4
             THE COURT: Absolutely.
 5
             MR. GAVIN: Okay. Ajibola Erogbogbo.
 6
                       AJIBOLA EROGBOGBO,
 7
  called by the defendant, first being duly sworn, testified
                           as follows:
8
9
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION
10
   BY MR. GAVIN:
11
        Good morning, sir.
12
        Good morning.
13
        Sir, I'm going to you ask you to pronounce your name
  and then spell your name for the court reporter.
14
15
        My name is Ajibola Erogbogbo. First name is
  A-J-I-B-O-L-A. My last name is E-R-O-G-B-O-G-B-O.
17
        Sir, are you an inmate currently at Petersburg
18 Medium?
19
        I am.
20
        Were you an inmate at Petersburg Medium beginning
21 January 2018?
22 A
        I was. Oh, I was there prior to that, but yes.
23
        You were still there in January --
24 A
        I was there, yes.
        Did you have a job there?
```

```
51
                Ajibola Erogbogbo - Direct
1
        I did.
2
        Were you interviewed by the FBI in this case around
 3
   April of last year?
        I was.
 4
 5
        Were you also called before the grand jury?
 6
        I was.
 7
        Did you provide truthful testimony to the grand jury?
8
        I did.
  Α
9
        Any changes in your testimony that you recall between
10
   the grand jury and your interview with the agents?
11
        No.
12
        Where did you work at the facility?
13
        Initially, I worked as an education tutor. Then I
  worked in the commissary.
14
15
        As an education tutor, what was your role?
        My role was to tutor inmates who were studying to get
16
17
   their GED.
18
        And did that include access to legal cases, the law
  library?
19
        It did.
20
21
        And what kind of research tools were available to you
22 In the law library?
23
        In the law library, there's a compendium of legal
24 cases called -- it's a software called LexisNexis where it
   compiles legal cases from all over the country, and it
```

```
52
                Ajibola Erogbogbo - Direct
   shows the background, also the summary, and how it was
1
 2
   adjudicated.
        Are you familiar with a gentleman by the name of
 3
  Brandon Lemagne?
 4
 5
        I am.
        How are you familiar with Mr. Lemagne?
 6
 7
        Lemagne and I were really good friends, probably the
   closest friend I had on the compound.
8
9
        At any point did you guys have an intimate
10
  relationship?
        We did.
11
12 Q
        Did it end badly?
13 A
        No.
        Okay. In your course of working at the compound, did
14
15 Mr. Lemagne ask you to assist him with anything?
        He did.
16
  Α
17
        What did he ask you to assist him with?
18
        A few times Lemagne asked me to help him look up
   cases on the LexisNexis document search. Yeah, on the
19
20
  computer.
21
        To your memory, was he familiar with how to use
22 LexisNexis?
23
        To my memory, he wasn't really familiar on how to
24 navigate LexisNexis.
        Did you have to show him how to use LexisNexis?
```

```
53
                Ajibola Erogbogbo - Direct
1
        I did.
2
        And did you show him how to use LexisNexis?
 3
        I did.
        So would you provide search tools or search subjects
 4
 5
   or would he provide search subjects?
        He would direct me to search certain things on the
 6
 7
  LexisNexis software.
        All right. On around early of 2018, were there any
8
   particular topics that Mr. Lemagne was asking you to
10
   research or help him research?
11
        Yes, there were.
12
        And what was he asking you to help him research?
13
        Specifically, inmate and staff misconduct at prisons.
  It was specifically that. And fraud -- general fraud
14
15
   subjects and the disposition.
        And when you were doing that, were you sitting beside
16
17
  him or did you just help him and tell him to go on his
18
  own?
        I sat literally right next to him.
19
20
   Q
        So you saw everything that was being entered?
21 A
        Yes.
22 Q
        You saw everything that was being produced?
23
        At certain times, I was the one scrolling while he
24 was looking.
        All right. When you were looking at the screen and
```

```
54
                Ajibola Erogbogbo - Direct
  he was doing his research, did you get the impression that
1
 2
   he was looking for --
 3
             THE COURT: Stay away from impressions.
             MR. GAVIN: All right. Sorry.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Just stick to what people said.
 6
             MR. GAVIN: Sorry.
 7
   BY MR. GAVIN:
        Did you review with Mr. Lemagne tools to help him
8
   gain an advantage in a Medicare health business after he
   was released?
10
11
        I did.
12
        Was that to help him set up a business or was it to
13 help him defraud the business?
        It was to help him commit fraud.
14
15
        All right. When he was researching items that dealt
  with sexual assault by officers, did you look up
17
   particular cases?
18
        Not necessarily particular cases, but he would ask me
   to look it up. And when you look it up, there's a section
19
20
  on the LexisNexis software where you can briefly scroll
21
   through all the cases and see if it was a civil case or a
22 Criminal case and what the disposition was.
23
        And was Mr. Lemagne interested in the dispositions?
        Yes, he was.
24
        Did he ever ask you to print anything out?
```

```
55
                Ajibola Erogbogbo - Direct
1
        Yes, he did.
2
        What did he ask you to print out?
3
        I don't remember specifically all the things we
   printed out, but there were several things we printed out.
 5
  And I remember one specific case was a New York City --
  New York state correction officer. It was a civil lawsuit
  where I think the inmate won the lawsuit, and it was
 7
  settled.
8
9
        Do you remember what the amount was of the
10
   settlement?
        I don't remember exactly. I want to say something
11
12 around $200,000, but I do not remember exactly.
13
        How did you relate this when you were asked by law
  enforcement as to the time that these research requests
14
15 were taking place?
       Well, I knew it was in the evening because I work
16
17
  during the day, and I -- I take classes at the prison.
18 And at that time, I knew I was taking a bookkeeping class
   because the bookkeeping class is only offered at a certain
19
20
  Itime during the year. So I -- I was able to say it was
21
   when I was taking my bookkeeping class.
22
        Did Mr. Lemagne tell you how he was planning to use
23 the information that was researched?
       Yes, he did.
24 A
       What did he say?
```

```
56
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
        He said he was writing an urban fiction novel and
 2
   that he wanted to use that as some story lines.
 3
        At some point, sir, did you become aware that the
   allegations against Mr. Legins took place?
 4
 5
        I was aware. I became aware, yes.
 6
        And what did you do?
 7
        I immediately contacted -- attempted to contact the
   special investigative agent a few hours after I heard.
8
9
   asked two officers if they could contact him, and they
10
   attempted to, and he couldn't speak to me on the day of.
11
        And was that within days of the event taking --
        No. It was within hours of finding out what
12
13
  happened.
14
             MR. GAVIN: No other questions, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. Any cross?
15
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
16
17
   BY MS. GILBERT:
18
        Good morning, Mr. Erogbogbo.
        Good morning.
19
20
        First, let's just establish. You have no firsthand
21 knowledge about what happened or what didn't happen on
22 May 10th, 2018, in the unit secretary's office, right?
23
        That is correct.
        You didn't see the defendant take Mr. Lemagne into
24
   that area for a period of time?
```

57 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross 1 That is correct. I did not see that. 2 And you didn't see them come out? 3 Did not see that. So you don't know if any physical evidence was 4 5 collected that night, right? Do not know. 6 7 But despite having no firsthand knowledge, you said that you thought you had information about this case? 8 I said -- I believe I had information that could 9 possibly help the case or, I mean, fill in a part of a 11 puzzle apparently. I didn't know what they were looking 12 for. So you came forward with that theory after you heard 13 rumors about why defendant Legins had been walked off at 14 15 Petersburg, right? It wasn't a rumor. I heard it directly from 16 17 Lemagne's boyfriend. 18 You put together the information that you thought was relevant, and you formed an opinion you wanted to share? 19 20 I wouldn't say it was an opinion. I thought it was 21 very relevant after his boyfriend told me what happened. 22 When an officer gets walked off, that means he's in 23 trouble, right? 24 A Yes. And so you put that together, the rumors that you had

```
58
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
  heard, plus some legal research that you said Brandon
1
 2
   Lemagne did. And so you assumed that Brandon Lemagne
   accused the defendant of having sex with him?
 3
        It wasn't a rumor. This was because of what his
 4
 5
   boyfriend/cellmate told me that afternoon.
        So just so the jurors understand, you reached out
 6
 7
   actually not just to one correctional officer, but to
   several correctional officers because you were very eager
8
   to share the information that you had, right?
9
10
        I reached out to two correction officers.
11
       Didn't you just say that you reached out to Officer
  Hall, Officer Adajeffrey(phonetic) --
13
        Yes.
   Α
        -- Mr. Norman and another SIS lieutenant?
14
        No. I reached out to Officer Hall and Officer
15
  Adajeffrey to contact Special Investigative Agent Norman.
17
        You wanted those officers to know that you had
  information that you thought would help out their
18
19
   colleague, right?
20
        No. I wanted them to contact Norman so I could speak
   to Norman.
21
22
        But it was because you thought you had information
   that was going to help out an officer, right?
23
        Well, not to help out the officer, but to help out
24
   the case. I wasn't specifically trying to help an
```

```
59
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
   officer. I felt like I knew something about what was
 2
   going on.
 3
        And then after you talked to officers and you didn't
   get any special treatment from them, you talked to federal
 4
 5
   agents, right?
 6
        I wouldn't say that I was expecting special treatment
 7
  from them, but eventually, Norman spoke to me, yes.
        But you also talked to federal agents, right?
8
        I did.
9
10
        And, in fact, when we sat down -- you and I and
  federal agents -- to talk before a federal grand jury, the
11
12
   very first thing you asked me was what benefit you would
13
   get for coming forward with information in this case,
   correct?
14
15
        Yes.
16
       You thought that --
17
             THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear what you
18
  said.
19
             THE WITNESS: I said yes, sir.
20
  BY MS. GILBERT:
21
       You thought you could get something out of me because
  I also work for the federal government?
23
        Oh, no. I thought I could go to a halfway house
24 earlier because I think I made it clear to you that I felt
  there were some security implications for me as an inmate
```

```
60
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
   coming out in regards to this case.
 2
        So you said you wanted to get time off your sentence,
 3
   right?
        I said I wanted to go to the halfway house earlier.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Does that mean you would be released
 6
   from prison to go to a halfway house --
 7
             THE WITNESS: Yes. Currently --
             THE COURT: Hold on. Let me finish my question.
8
9
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
10
             THE COURT: My question is does that mean
   that -- the halfway house is in the public as opposed to
11
   being in a prison; is that right?
13
             THE WITNESS: Correct. That's community
   confinement.
14
15
             THE COURT: That's what you were trying to get
16
  out of this?
17
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
18
             THE COURT: Okay.
   BY MS. GILBERT:
19
20
        But then when you were asked in the grand jury just a
21 If ew minutes later if you hoped to get some kind of
22 reduction in the amount of time you had to live in prison,
   you said no at first, right?
23
       Well, because I wasn't considering it a reduction.
24
  was considering it going to the halfway house a year
```

```
61
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
   earlier, yes.
        You said no until we asked again, didn't you ask us
2
 3
   when we met earlier today whether you would get any
  benefit from speaking with us, right?
 4
 5
        Correct.
        And then you admitted to the grand jury that, yes,
 6
 7
  you had asked for a benefit for coming forward with
  information you thought was useful?
8
9
        Correct.
10
        At the end of your grand jury testimony, didn't you
  make clear that what you thought you deserved was 15
11
12
  months off your sentence?
13
        Correct. Fifteen months in the halfway house, yes.
        Didn't you actually say, quote, I mean, I would love
14
15
  like a 15-month time cut so my time would go to zero?
16
        Correct.
17
        And then when we met a couple weeks ago, you again
18
  said you wanted 12 months off your sentence at that point
   so you could go to a halfway house, right?
19
20
        Well, the last time we met, I mean, I was a few
21 months away from going to the halfway house. Just like
22 II'm a month away from going to the halfway house now.
23
        But didn't you say that you wanted to go immediately
24 Ito the halfway house, that by coming forward with these
   theories, you could walk out of prison?
```

62 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross 1 Correct. And I also stated that there were security 2 implications for me as an inmate. 3 Why are you in prison, Mr. Erogbogbo? Interference with commerce is what I was charged 4 5 with. Is that the complete name of your offense? 6 7 I think interference with commerce by robbery or interference with commerce. 8 9 Let's talk about your relationship with Brandon 10 Lemagne. 11 Yes. 12 When you first spoke with federal agents about your 13 theory of this case, you told the agents that you and Brandon Lemagne were best friends, right? 14 15 Yes. Where was Brandon Lemagne originally from? 16 17 Virginia, and he lived in Florida prior to coming to 18 prison. Didn't you tell the grand jury you didn't know where 19 20 Brandon Lemagne was originally from? 21 Well, I mean, that -- I'm not sure if -- exactly what 22 II said, but I knew he was from Virginia and he lived in 23 Florida. But you don't know that he was from New York? 24

I don't know -- yeah. I don't know if he's from

```
63
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
   either.
 2
        You said you spent time together every day, right?
 3
        Almost every day, yes.
        And the first time you spoke to federal agents, you
 4
 5
   didn't say anything about being in a sexual relationship
   with Mr. Lemagne, right?
 6
 7
        Correct, because I didn't think it was relevant.
8
        You didn't think that in this case about sexual abuse
   of an inmate, that your sexual relationship with the
   person you came forward with information about was
   relevant?
11
12
        No.
13
        But then when we met before the grand jury, you said
  for the first time that you did have a sexual relationship
14
15
  with Brandon Lemagne, right?
        Correct.
16
17
        How many times did you say you had sex with Brandon
18
  Lemagne?
19
        I don't remember how many times I said, but I think
20
   it was around four or five times.
21
        Is that because what you said wasn't true?
   Q.
        It's because I don't remember.
22
23
        You actually said that Mr. Lemagne told you he wanted
24 to elope with you, right?
        Yeah, like why couldn't we do something and get away.
```

```
64
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
   Yes.
2
        Wasn't Brandon Lemagne in a relationship with Ronzell
 3
   Jackson during this time at Petersburg?
        I guess you could say --
 4
 5
        Mr. Erogbogbo, it's a yes-or-no question.
 6
        I can't answer that with a yes-or-no question -- with
 7
   a yes or no.
        You can't say that Brandon was in a relationship with
8
   Ronzell Jackson?
9
10
        No, I can't, because his actions publicly were
11
   different from his actions privately.
12
        You were never publicly in a romantic or sexual
13
  relationship with Brandon Lemagne, right?
14
        No, I was not.
15
        So the sexual relationship that you claim happened,
  nobody knows about that except for you, right?
17
   Α
        Correct.
18
        You claim that you were best friends with Brandon
19
   Lemagne up until the day that he was segregated, right?
20
        Correct.
21
        And you never saw him again before he got
22 transferred, right?
23
        That is correct.
        You never got to say goodbye to the person that you
24
   call your best friend?
```

65

```
Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
        Correct.
 2
        And so the same day that your best friend got taken
 3
   to segregation, you learned that there was a rumor that he
  had been sexually assaulted by the defendant, right?
 4
 5
        Correct.
 6
        And then that day, without having had a chance to
 7
   talk to your best friend and without knowing any
   information personally about what actually happened, you
9
   tracked down an investigator to say you had information to
10
   share about your best friend, right?
11
        Oh, no. That's not correct.
12
        Didn't you just testify that you went forward to
13
   officers and said that you had information --
        No. No. You said -- no. No. You said
14
15
  not having any information about knowing what happened.
  His boyfriend, Ronzell Jackson, spoke to me that day
16
   outside and alluded to the fact that something did happen.
17
18
   So --
19
        Let's talk about what you had to say to authorities
20
   about the person who was your best friend.
21
   Α
        Okay.
22
        You jumped at the chance to tell the authorities that
   you thought Brandon Lemagne was somehow framing the
23
  defendant, correct?
25
             MR. GAVIN: Objection to the form of the
```

```
66
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
   question.
              That's not what his testimony was.
2
              THE COURT: Overruled.
 3
   BY MS. GILBERT:
        You may answer the question.
 4
 5
        Can you repeat the question, please?
        Sure. You jumped at the chance to tell authorities
 6
 7
   that you thought Brandon Lemagne was somehow framing the
   defendant, right?
8
9
        Yes.
10
        Even though you didn't know what the defendant had or
11
  \blacksquarehad not done to Brandon, you were eager to say that --
12
              THE COURT: Mr. Lemagne. We're going to get
13
   there.
             MS. GILBERT: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor.
14
15
   apologize.
              THE COURT: Before you go farther, I just want
16
17
   to ask one question.
18
              THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
19
              THE COURT: You said in addition to talking to
20
   officers, you wanted to talk to somebody called
21
   Mr. Norman?
22
              THE WITNESS: Yeah. The way the --
23
              THE COURT: Who is Mr. Norman?
24
              THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
25
              THE COURT: Who is Mr. Norman?
```

```
67
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
             THE WITNESS: Mr. Norman is the special
 2
   investigative agent of the prison. So when something
 3
   sensitive happens and I need to speak to someone about the
   information, I don't just tell the officers what's going
 4
 5
   on -- what I have to say. I ask them if they can contact
   him, and then he contacts me, and then we speak privately.
 6
7
             THE COURT: Okay.
             THE WITNESS: For my safety.
8
9
             THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Ms. Gilbert.
10
             MS. GILBERT: Thank you, Your Honor.
11
   BY MS. GILBERT:
12
       So you were saying earlier that you jumped at the
  chance to talk to authorities and say that you thought
13
  Brandon Lemagne was framing the defendant. You'd agree
14
15
   that doesn't sound like something a person would do to a
  best friend, does it?
16
17
        Well, I think it sounds like something someone with a
18 conscience would do, yes, active conscience.
        You weren't actually best friends with Brandon, were
19
20 you?
21 A
        I think I was. I would consider myself, at that
22 time, best friends with Lemagne.
23
        Isn't it true that Mr. Lemagne tried to avoid you?
24 A
        That's not true.
        Isn't it true that he rejected your sexual advances?
```

```
68
                 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross
1
        That's not true.
        Isn't it true that he found you creepy?
 2
 3
        That's not true.
        You testified earlier about the computer research
 4
 5
   that you said Brandon Lemagne was doing. Isn't it true
 6
   that Brandon Lemagne was researching the Prison Rape
 7
   Elimination Act and --
8
        At one point.
9
        -- sexual harassment?
10
        Yes, he was.
11
        And isn't it true that he was researching those
12
  things after he mentioned to you that he had been sexually
13
  harassed in the laundry room?
        That is true.
14
        But you told federal agents, and you testified here
15
  today, that Mr. Lemagne was just asking you for help
   researching sexual acts between inmates and officers?
17
18
        Well, Lemagne asked me to research several things on
   the computer, including fraud, including policy codes.
19
20
  mean, that was one of them, yes.
21
        Didn't Mr. Lemagne work in the library?
22
        No. Lemagne did not work in the library. He worked
   as a clerk for an education staff member.
23
        Wasn't it literally his job to help people in the
24
  library?
```

69

Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross 1 No, that was not his job. 2 So just repeating the truth about Mr. Lemagne 3 researching the Prison Rape Elimination Act wasn't going to get any benefits, right? 4 5 Can you repeat the question? I'll rephrase it. Didn't you think that it would 6 7 interest the officers at the prison more if you said that Mr. Lemagne was researching inmates and officers, as you 8 put it before the grand jury, messing around? 10 No, I didn't think either. It would affect the 11 outcome either/or. 12 Isn't that why you didn't tell them about Brandon 13 Lemagne's research of the Prison Rape Elimination Act and sexual harassment after he said that an officer sexually 14 15 harassed him? That's not true. Lemagne and I researched several 16 things, like I said. It's impossible for me to remember 17 18 every single thing we researched. And, in fact, you didn't tell federal agents about 19 20 the Prison Rape Elimination Act research, right? 21 They did ask me, and after they asked me, I recalled 22 and I said yes. 23 Well, actually, so you met with the federal agents at 24 one point. Yes.

70 Ajibola Erogbogbo - Cross 1 You didn't mention that. But then later in grand 2 jury you, for the first time before a grand jury when you 3 were pointedly asked whether Mr. Lemagne ever told you he had been sexually harassed, that was when you said that 5 you wanted to backtrack and admitted to the grand jury that Mr. Lemagne had been researching the Prison Rape 6 7 Elimination Act and sexual harassment. Again, Lemagne was my best friend, and we researched 8 9 several things. 10 Let's talk a little bit more about you, 11 Mr. Erogbogbo. 12 Okay. 13 You admitted in grand jury that you are a pretty convincing liar, right? 14 15 I quess so, yes. You talked about how you always lied to Mr. Lemagne 16 17 about what you were in prison for? 18 Yes. You told him that you were in prison for credit card 19 20 fraud? 21 That is correct. Α 22 But actually, you're in prison for robbery, correct? 23 Yes. You lied because it helped you create a false persona 24 in prison, right?

```
71
               Ajibola Erogbogbo - Redirect
1
        That is correct.
 2
        And to be clear, persona was your word, not mine?
 3
        Probably yeah.
        You thought it was helpful to you to be known as a
 4
 5
   credit card fraudster because, to use your words again,
   credit card fraud was cool?
 6
 7
        Yes.
8
        So you lied to Brandon Lemagne and others to create a
   false persona to benefit yourself?
10
        That is correct.
        You also boasted to the grand jury that you're good
11
12
   at talking your way out of situations?
13
        I don't know if I boasted. But if they asked the
   question, I probably said yes.
14
15
        You also said that you're good at wiggling out of
  things, right?
16
17
   Α
        Yes.
18
             MS. GILBERT: Thank you, Mr. Erogbogbo.
             THE COURT: Any redirect?
19
20
             MR. GAVIN:
                          Yes.
21
                       REDIRECT EXAMINATION
   BY MR. GAVIN:
22
23
        Sir, when you approached the officers, did you use
   the words Mr. Lemagne is trying to frame anybody?
             I just said I need to speak to Mr. Norman
```

```
72
               Ajibola Erogbogbo - Redirect
1
   because something happened, and I need to talk to him
 2
   about it.
 3
        So you weren't jumping at the bit --
        No, I wasn't.
 4
 5
        -- as it's been inferred to say somebody was framing
 6
   somebody?
 7
        Can I answer that in a long way, if that's --
        If it gets too long, we'll cut you off.
8
9
        Well, the -- I think it wasn't made clear that the
   reason that I went to the officers -- I went to the
   officers immediately after Brandon Lemagne's cellmate,
11
   Ronzell Jackson, told me that Officer Legins was walked
12
13
  off the compound and alluded to the fact that my friend
  had something to do with it.
14
15
        Is Officer Legins a personal friend of yours?
16
        No.
17
        Do you know him well?
18
        No.
        When you were talking with the United States about
19
20
  Itrying to get into a halfway house early, is that because
21
   you had security concerns?
22
        I made that very clear, yes.
23
        What were your security concerns, and why?
        Well, it's two-fold. Number one, the fact that I'm
24
   speaking to a special investigative agent about a case
```

```
73
               Ajibola Erogbogbo - Redirect
   that occurred at the prison, I could face retribution from
1
2
   the staff because they don't know whose side I'm on, and I
3
   could also face retribution from the inmates because they
   don't know whose side I'm on. So being that they don't
 5
   know who -- what I'm saying, the danger comes -- could
  potentially come from both sides.
 6
 7
        So the only thing you were asking the United States
  was whether or not you could get to a different type of
8
  incarceration other than staying there?
10
        Correct.
        Matter of fact, did you tell me that you had security
11
12
   concerns just by talking with me?
13
        I told you, and I told the United States government,
14
  a few weeks ago.
15
             MR. GAVIN: Okay. I don't have any other
16
  questions.
17
             THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you for your
18
  testimony. You can step down. I'm going to instruct you
   that you're not to discuss your testimony with anybody
19
20
   until the trial is over. All right?
21
             THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: You're excused.
23
             (Witness stood aside.)
                         Judge, there are three inmates that
24
             MR. GAVIN:
     don't need them for anything else, if the marshal wants
```

```
74
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Direct
1
   to release them.
             THE COURT: All right. Did you hear what he
2
 3
   said, the other inmates?
             Do you have any other evidence, then?
 4
 5
             MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir. Ken Mikionis.
             THE COURT: Is someone going to get him?
 6
 7
                        KENNETH MIKIONIS,
8
   called by the defendant, first being duly sworn, testified
9
                           as follows:
10
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
   BY MR. GAVIN:
11
12
        Could you state your name, sir?
       Kenneth L. Mikionis.
13
       Mr. Mikionis --
14
             THE COURT: And spell your first and your last
15
16 | name, please.
17
             THE WITNESS: First name K-E-N-N-E-T-H. Last
18
  name M-I-K-I-O-N-I-S.
  BY MR. GAVIN:
19
        Mr. Mikionis, how are you employed now?
20
21 A
        I'm a private investigator with the Commonwealth of
22 Virginia.
23
        Have you previously worked in law enforcement?
24 A
        Yes.
        Where?
```

```
75
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Direct
1
        Special agent with the FBI for 28 years.
 2
        When did you retire from the FBI?
 3
        End of 2007.
        And your -- when you retired, did you just enter into
 4
 5
   the private practice as a private investigator?
 6
        Yes.
   Α
 7
        All right. Did I ask for your assistance in helping
  me investigate this case?
8
9
        Yes.
10
   Q
        And did you?
11
        Yes.
12
        I'm going to show you --
13
             MR. GAVIN: Mr. Spivey, if I could, and ask
  Ms. Brown to bring up what's already been admitted as
14
15
  Defense Exhibit 4.
  BY MR. GAVIN:
16
17
        That's a hard copy, Mr. Mikionis, but the evidence
  copy is on the screen. Do you recognize that document?
18
19
   Α
        Yes, I do.
20
        What is that?
21
        That is the Bureau of Prisons work history for
22 Mr. Legins.
23
        And does that reflect the days that Mr. Legins worked
   and where he was assigned on any particular day?
        Yes.
```

```
76
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Direct
        And did I ask you to look at where he worked on two
1
 2
   particular days?
 3
        Yes, you did.
        And were those days February 17th and February 19th
 4
 5
   of 2018?
 6
        Yes.
   Α
 7
        I'd ask you to flip over to page 15 of the report
   that's in front of you. Does page 15 of that report
8
  reflect Mr. Legins' work history on February 17th, 2018?
10
        Yes.
       Does it indicate that at any point he worked in
11
12
  C-South?
13
        No.
        If you look at February 19th, 2018, does it indicate
14
15
  where he worked?
        Yes. It's a day off. It says "Day Off."
16
17
        So it doesn't indicate he was working in the compound
18
  on February 19th?
19
   Α
        Correct.
20
        That's his day off?
21
        Yes.
22
             MR. GAVIN: I have no other questions on that
23
  exhibit.
24
             Ms. Brown, would you bring up D-8, the pictures?
  BY MR. GAVIN:
```

```
77
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Direct
1
        Mr. Legins(sic), you went with me to the Petersburg
 2
   Medium facility, did you not, several weeks ago?
 3
        Yes.
        Were we allowed to take in any type of recording
 4
 5
   device?
 6
        No.
   Α
 7
        Were we allowed to take in any type of photographic
   device?
8
9
        No.
10
        When we went there, what was our goal?
11
        We were doing a time trial at the south -- Fox South
   and the corridor between Fox South and Fox North.
12
13
        All right. So were we accompanied to this area?
14
        Yes.
15
        And who accompanied us?
        Mr. Norman and two other staff members.
16
17
        Because we were not able to take in any recording
18
  devices, did we ask one of those gentleman to use his
19
   stopwatch to assist us?
20
        Yes.
21
        And did he agree?
22
             THE COURT: Mr. Gavin, how about -- I understand
   you went with him, but he's the witness, not you. Let's
23
   just ask him what he did. Let's take you out of the
24
  equation, because you're a lawyer here. Not a witness.
```

```
78
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Direct
             MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir.
1
 2
   BY MR. GAVIN:
 3
        Was a stopwatch utilized?
        Yes, it was.
 4
 5
        Was it your stopwatch or was it the facility member's
 6
   stopwatch?
 7
        It was a staff member's stopwatch.
8
        So did that staff member accompany us to this area?
9
        Yes.
10
        All right. Did I ask you and Mr. Norman to
11
  participate in these measurements?
12
        Yes.
13
        Do you remember what the first measurement was?
14
        I believe it was -- oh, the measurement? I'm sorry.
15
        Yes, sir.
   Q
        Measurement was 49 feet.
16
17
        Okay. That 49 feet is the distance between the one
18
  corridor door and the other corridor door?
19
        Correct.
20
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Brown, could you pull up B?
21 BY MR. GAVIN:
22
        All right. Do you recognize those doors?
23
        Yes.
        Did we ask Mr. -- did you ask -- well, I asked the
24
  questions. Did you hear me ask Mr. Norman to open that
```

```
79
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Direct
1
   door, turn around, shut that down, and stop?
 2
        Yes.
 3
        And did he do that?
 4
        Yes, he did.
 5
        And did his recorder provide a time to you for that?
 6
        Yes.
   Α
 7
        What was the time?
8
        I'd like to refer to my notes for that.
9
        Okay.
10
             MR. GAVIN: Can he refer to his notes,
11
  Your Honor?
12
             THE COURT: Of course.
  BY MR. GAVIN:
13
        While you're doing that, Mr. Mikionis, are those
14
  notes that you took down contemporaneously as the
  gentleman was advising you of the time?
17
   Α
        Yes.
18
        And what was the first measurement?
19
        The first measurement was 11 seconds.
20
        What was the second measurement?
21 A
        Describe the measurement?
22
        No. What was the second distance that we tried to
23 determine?
24
        It was between the exterior door and the interior
  door of the office.
```

```
80
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Direct
1
        And was that opening and closing or just to the door?
 2
        Just to the door.
 3
        And what was that time?
        It was nine seconds.
 4
 5
        Now, what was the next measurement?
        It was unlocking the exterior corridor to the office,
 6
 7
  walking through and closing that door.
        And what was that measurement?
8
        Five seconds.
9
10
        All right. What was the next measurement?
        It was walking to the rear portion of the office, to
11
12
   a pole in the office that was supporting the ceiling.
13
        And what was that measurement?
        Three seconds.
14
15
        What was the next measurement?
        It was walking into the bathroom, washing hands and
16
17
   exiting, standing by the door.
18
        And what was that measurement?
19
        Twenty seconds.
20
        What was the next measurement that we requested?
21 |A
        Walk to the exit door of the office, walk through it,
22 \| and then close the door and stand in the corridor.
23
        And how long did that take?
        Seven seconds.
24
        And what was the last measurement?
```

```
81
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Cross
1
        Walking down the corridor toward the north -- Fox
   North, walking through the door, exiting the door and then
 3
   closing the door and locking it.
        And what was the time for that?
 4
 5
        Fifteen seconds.
 6
        When we did these measurements, who was doing the
 7
  walking?
        The staff investigator, Mr. Norman.
8
9
        Did you notice that he was walking at any particular
   pace, whether fast, slow, normal?
11
        I would say it was a normal -- normal pace.
12
        Was there any delays included in the time or was it a
  direct path from A to B for each measurement?
        A to B. It was --
14
15
        All right. So what was the total amount of time that
  it took to take these measurements from the doors to the
17
   other side of the doors, to the back room, to the
  bathroom, to the exit?
18
19
        Seventy seconds.
20
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, I don't have any other
21
   questions.
22
             THE COURT: Any cross?
23
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
  BY MR. GARNETT:
        Good morning, Mr. Mikionis.
```

```
82
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Cross
1
        Good morning.
 2
        Mr. Mikionis, during this measurement exercise, you
 3
   said you were walking at the pace of Bruce Norman; is that
   right?
 4
 5
        Yes.
              You have no idea how fast the defendant may or
 6
        Okay.
 7
  may not have been walking on May 10th; is that right?
8
        No.
   Α
9
        You have no idea for how long the defendant may or
  may not have washed his hands on May 10th; is that right?
11
        That's right.
12
        Okay. You have no idea whether or not the defendant
  may or may not have actually unlocked the doors as were
13
   timed in your measurements; is that right?
14
15
        No, I don't know that.
16
        Okay.
17
             MR. GARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.
18
             THE COURT: Do you have any redirect?
19
             MR. GAVIN:
                        No, sir.
20
             THE COURT: All right, Mr. Mikionis. You can
21
   step down. Thank you for your testimony --
22
             THE WITNESS: Thank you.
23
             THE COURT: -- being here today. I'm going to
   instruct you not to talk about your testimony with anybody
24
  until the case is over. Okay?
```

```
83
                 Kenneth Mikionis - Cross
1
             (Witness stood aside.)
2
             THE COURT: I think this is a good opportunity
 3
   for us to take a break so you can go order your lunch.
   How does that sound? All right.
 5
             So what we're going to do is everybody is going
   to rise for the jury. We're going to take a break
 6
 7
   until -- let's give you until 11:15 because that will give
   you five minutes to ponder your order.
8
9
             (The jury exited the courtroom.)
10
             THE COURT: All right. Is there -- how much
11
   longer do you have?
12
             MR. GAVIN: One witness.
13
             THE COURT: One witness?
             MR. GAVIN: We need to discuss Mr. Norman.
14
15
             THE COURT:
                         Well, let's -- everybody can sit
          We're going to discuss what else you need to do.
16
   down.
17
             MR. GAVIN: Mr. Norman was a witness that was
   going to be a very short witness. The only thing I was
18
   going to ask him, because he didn't talk to me willingly
19
20
  before trial, was whether or not he remembered anything
21
   distinct about Mr. Lemagne's demeanor or the folder when
22 he walked right by him and looked at the folder when he
   was exiting Fox North on March 16.
23
24
             MS. GILBERT: Is it Farmer?
25
             MR. GARNETT: Your Honor, I think there's
```

```
confusion. I think we're talking about Officer Farmer, as
1
 2
   opposed to Bruce Norman.
 3
             MR. GAVIN: Farmer. Farmer. I'm sorry.
 4
             MS. GILBERT: He is here.
 5
             MR. GARNETT: He is here, Your Honor. I'm
           There was some confusion. Officer Farmer has
 6
   sorry.
 7
   been --
8
             MR. GAVIN: Okay.
9
             MR. GARNETT: He's here.
10
             MR. GAVIN: Well, then it would be two
  witnesses, and they'd be very --
11
12
             THE COURT: Well, he was called the wrong name
13
  before, then.
             MR. GAVIN: I must have.
14
             THE COURT: You called him Norman instead of
15
  Farmer.
16
17
             MR. GAVIN: I must have.
             THE COURT: Officer Farmer is the guy that was
18
  here at the end the day yesterday.
19
20
             MR. GAVIN: Yeah. That's what I was thinking.
   That's why I was surprised he wasn't here.
22
             THE COURT: Okay. So you have Officer Farmer.
23
  And then who else do you have?
24
             MR. GAVIN: My expert, Jean Cheek.
25
             THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right.
```

And do you expect rebuttal or no? MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Okay. All right. The jury's lunch is not going to get here until 1:00. So you're probably going to be about 11:30 or so. I'm just going to give them a really long lunch. We'll deal with anything else we need to deal with before closing arguments.

What I want to do is I want to go over the exhibits to make sure we're all on the same page, and what we're going to do is this. So due to your numbering challenges, I've assigned my law clerk to type up an exhibit list for you, and I want you to go over it with him. Because I'm going to give the exhibits -- I'm going to give the indictment, the jury instructions, the exhibit list from both sides, and the stipulations, as well as the exhibits, to the jury so that they have a roadmap, so if they want to look for something, they can do that. So I want you to check to make sure the exhibit list that my law clerk typed up reflects what you want to do. You check it to make sure you have no objections. We used generic language, but I want to make sure that there's no objection.

Then for the government, what we're going to do 24 \[is we're going to take your -- Mr. Garnett, your list. We'll redact any ones -- any exhibits that you did not use

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

so that -- instead of retyping it, and then we'll give the redacted version of the government's exhibit list to the jury.

So when we're done here, we're just going to take a little extra time. I'm going to explain to the jury what's going on here, and then -- I don't think they get their lunch until 1:00. I actually have the duty at 1:00 anyhow. So what I'll do is I'll probably bring them back at 1:45.

And then, Ms. Gilbert, you'll open. How long do you think you're going to go in your opening argument?

MS. GILBERT: It's about 35 minutes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And then -- all right. So what I'm going to do is --

15 MS. GILBERT: I'm sorry to interrupt, Your Honor. That doesn't include rebuttal. 16

THE COURT: No. That's okay. That's fine. I'm not going to hold you to it. I mean, I just want to keep going here, right. So I think what I'm going to do is we'll start at 1:45. We'll do her argument and then we'll do your argument. Then I'm going to recess. We'll do the 22 rebuttal, and then I'll instruct the jury, and then we'll kind of go from there. Does that make -- everybody okay with that plan?

MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir.

```
1
             THE COURT: All right. Okay. Is there anything
 2
   else we need to deal with?
 3
             MR. GAVIN:
                          No, sir.
             THE COURT:
                          So, Ms. Gilbert, I want to tell you,
 4
 5
   you know, I've chewed on you a couple of times. I don't
 6
   want to make you gun-shy, though, in doing your job.
 7
   appreciate you asking me today, but you still do your job.
   Okay?
8
9
             MS. GILBERT: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
             THE COURT: I only yell when it's appropriate.
   Okay.
11
          All right.
12
             MR. ROSENDAHL: All rise.
13
             THE COURT: Oh, wait a minute. We're -- yeah,
   we'll take our recess until --
14
15
              (Recess from 11:00 a.m. until 11:15 a.m.)
             THE COURT: All right. Bring the jury in.
16
17
             All rise.
              (The jury entered the courtroom.)
18
19
             THE COURT: All right. Everybody can be seated,
   please.
20
21
             Everybody doing okay?
22
             A JUROR:
                        Yes.
23
             THE COURT: Did you order a Thanksgiving dinner
   there for lunch?
24
25
             All right, Mr. Gavin.
```

```
1
             MR. GAVIN: Duane Farmer, Your Honor.
2
             THE COURT: Mr. Farmer, do you want to come back
3
             Why don't you have a seat. Officer Farmer,
   you're going to -- you were placed under oath yesterday.
 5
   It continues today. Do you understand that?
6
             MR. FARMER: Yes, sir.
 7
             THE COURT: Just please state your full name
8
   again for the court reporter.
9
             MR. FARMER: Duane Farmer.
10
             THE COURT:
                          All right, Mr. Gavin.
11
                          DUANE FARMER,
     called by the defendant, having been previously sworn,
12
13
                      testified as follows:
14
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
15
   BY MR. GAVIN:
        Good morning, Mr. Farmer.
16
17
        Good morning.
18
        Mr. Farmer, I'm sure you don't remember your work
19
   schedule day by day. So I'm going to show you a video of
20
   a particular day, March 16th.
21
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Taylor.
22
              (Video Played.)
23
             MS. TAYLOR: Sorry.
             THE COURT: This is the video from March 16,
24
```

```
89
                   Duane Farmer - Direct
1
             MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir.
2
             (Video Played.)
 3
             MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Gavin.
 4
             MR. GAVIN: Yes, ma'am.
 5
             MS. TAYLOR: Just let me know if this isn't the
 6
   right --
7
             MR. GAVIN: Okay.
8
             MS. TAYLOR: Is that right?
9
             MR. GAVIN: That's fine. You can stop there.
   I'm at time stamp 18:28:54.
   BY MR. GAVIN:
11
12
        Mr. Farmer, do you recognize that door?
13
       Based on the stencil on the wall, that's Fox North
14 unit.
        Do you recognize the person that's in the middle of
15
  the picture to the right side?
17
        That looks like Inmate Lemagne.
18
  Q
        Okay.
19
             MR. GAVIN: Ms. Taylor, can you let it play?
20
             (Video Played.)
21
             MR. GAVIN: Can you stop it right there,
22 Ms. Taylor?
23
  BY MR. GAVIN:
24
        Do you recognize that handsome gentleman?
        That's me.
```

```
90
                   Duane Farmer - Direct
1
        So I assume that you were working on that day?
2
        Yes, sir.
 3
             MR. GAVIN: All right. Can you let it play,
 4
   Ms. Taylor?
 5
             (Video Played.)
             MR. GAVIN: Can you stop it there?
 6
 7
   BY MR. GAVIN:
8
        Mr. Norman, were you looking -- Mr. Norman.
9
             Mr. Farmer, were you looking at the file that
10
   Mr. Lemagne had in his hand?
11
        Yes.
12 Q
        Did you notice anything unusual about it?
13
        No.
        Did you notice any wetness about it, stains, anything
14
15
   of that nature?
        Don't remember anything like that, no.
16
17
        Do you remember anything that struck you as odd about
18
  Mr. Lemagne's demeanor on that day?
        I mean, on that particular day, it look like he was
19
20
  being him.
21
             MR. GAVIN: Can you let it play, Ms. Taylor?
22
              (Video Played.)
23
             MR. GAVIN: Thank you, Ms. Taylor.
  BY MR. GAVIN:
24
        At any point during that interaction did you get the
```

```
91
                    Jean Cheek - Direct
1
   impression that Mr. Lemagne was under stress?
 2
        No, sir.
 3
                         I don't have any other questions.
             MR. GAVIN:
             THE COURT: Any cross?
 4
 5
             MR. GARNETT: No cross, Your Honor.
 6
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Farmer, now I can
 7
   tell you the truth. You're excused. You don't have to
   come back. We appreciate your testimony. Please don't
8
   talk about your testimony with anybody else until our
10
   trial is over.
11
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
12
             THE COURT: I wish you well.
13
              (Witness stood aside.)
14
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gavin.
15
             MR. GAVIN: Jean Cheek.
             JEAN CHEEK, DNP, RN, BS, SANE-A, CN V,
16
17
  called by the defendant, first being duly sworn, testified
18
                           as follows:
19
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
20
   BY MR. GAVIN:
21
        Can you please state your name, ma'am?
22
        Jean Anne Cheek.
23
        I also need you to spell it for the court reporter.
24
        J-E-A-N, A-N-N-E, C-H-E-E-K.
        Ms. Cheek, how are you employed?
```

```
92
                    Jean Cheek - Direct
1
        I am a forensic nurse at VCU Health.
 2
        It looks like you're employed there today; is that
 3
   correct?
        Yes.
 4
 5
        You have several suffixes to your title in your name.
  What is a DNP?
 6
 7
        A doctorate of nursing practice.
8
        And RN?
   Q
9
        And registered nurse.
10
        SANE?
        Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner, Adult/Adolescent
11
12
   Certification.
13
        Is that what the A and the CN and the V stand for?
  There's an A also. Is that --
14
15
        Yes.
        And the CN?
16
17
        That's clinical nurse V.
18
        What's your -- how long have you been in this
  industry?
19
20
        Twenty years.
        And what is -- what have you been doing for the last
21
22 five?
23
        I've been a forensic nurse for 20 years. For the
24 last five years, I've been a full-time forensic nurse.
        Are you also engaged in teaching forensic nursing?
```

```
93
                    Jean Cheek - Direct
1
        Yes.
              I've been teaching different aspects of
 2
   forensics over the 20 years, but I do teach at a
 3
   university over the past year.
        Are you also involved in reviewing individual cases
 4
   yourself?
 5
 6
        Yes.
   Α
 7
        How many cases would you think that you've reviewed
   over the last five years?
8
9
        For --
10
   Q
        Sexual assault.
        Yeah. Is that like just related to my job or like
11
12 | for the --
13
        Either.
        Okay. Hundreds. 500, more probably.
14
15
        Do they involve males?
   Q
16
  Α
        Yes.
17
        Do they involve females?
18
  Α
        Yes.
19
        Do they involve the use of a rape kit? Are you
20
  familiar with a rape kit?
21
   Α
        Yes.
22
        Is that something you guys use routinely in your
23
  examinations?
24
        Yes, sir.
25
             MR. GAVIN: I ask that she be admitted as an
```

```
94
                    Jean Cheek - Direct
1
   expert?
2
             THE COURT: And you're not challenging that,
 3
   right?
 4
             MS. GILBERT: No.
 5
             THE COURT: Just to be clear, she's an expert in
   what?
 6
 7
             MR. GAVIN: Sexual assault examination.
8
             THE COURT: Okay. So accepted.
9
             Again, folks, you'll recall, experts can give
   you their opinions. She's just like all the other experts
  you've heard from. Okay?
11
  BY MR. GAVIN:
12
13
        Ms. Cheek, for purposes of today, did you, at my
  request, review several documents?
14
15
        I did.
        Did you review Mr. Lemagne's affidavit?
16
  Q
17
  Α
        I did.
18 Q
        Did you review the case agent's summary?
19
        I did.
  Α
20
  Q
        Did you review the records from St. Mary's?
21 A
        I did.
22 0
        When you looked at situations where injury may be
23
  evident in an exam, what are the factors that you're
24 looking for?
        We look at -- what I look at is what the history of
```

```
95
                    Jean Cheek - Direct
1
   the events were, what happened, positioning. Other
 2
   factors that might be involved such as the person's
 3
   health, age, those kinds of things.
        Do you look at sphincter tone?
 4
 5
        Yes.
 6
        Do you look at size of the penis involved?
 7
        I don't look at the person -- it's hard for me to say
   the size of the penis for the victim or --
8
9
        For the perpetrator.
10
        Occasionally, I do.
11
        Have you seen pictures of that in this particular
12
  case?
13
        Yes.
        All right. What other factors might weigh into your
14
15
   conclusion on whether or not damage should have been
  sustained by the victim?
16
17
        Different things like was there lubrication involved,
18
  the position of the assault, the duration, and the
   description of the perpetrator in what was happening.
19
20
        Was it your understanding that the event was a
   forceful event, based on your review of the records?
22
        Yes.
   Α
23
        Was it your understanding, based on your review of
24 I the records, that it lasted approximately five minutes?
        Yes.
```

```
96
                    Jean Cheek - Direct
1
        What was your understanding of the lubrication that
 2
   was used?
 3
        That there was saliva.
        Is saliva a particularly good lubricant?
 4
 5
        It's not because it's -- it evaporates quickly.
 6
        Did you have a chance to look at the St. Mary's
 7
   records?
        I did.
8
9
             MR. GAVIN: Can you pull those up, please?
10
   BY MR. GAVIN:
        Ms. Cheek, first, do you recognize these records as
11
   the St. Mary's records that I produced to you?
12
13
        I do.
14
        All right. Do you have the screen in front of you
15
   that shows page 4 of 8 of that report?
16
        Yes.
17
        I'm going to refer you to the "alternative forensic
18
  techniques" section.
19
        Okay.
        Does that section indicate that additional measures
20
21
   were taken to try to find damage?
        Yes. A colposcope was used to examine the patient.
22
23
        What is a colposcope?
        It is a device that's used that magnifies the area
24
   that is being examined so that any micro trauma can be
```

```
97
                    Jean Cheek - Direct
1
   identified.
 2
        When you say "micro trauma," what's micro trauma?
 3
        That's small trauma that would not be visual to the
 4
   eye.
 5
        And what is a toluidine -- toluidine dye uptake test?
        Toluidine blue dye is a dye that will go up into
 6
 7
  \parallelfreshly injured tissue, and the tissue will up-take it.
   So when you wipe away the excess, you can see that there's
8
   injured tissue that you might not have been able to see
   with your naked eye.
11
        I'm going to -- so is it your opinion that there
   isn't any damage of even a cell being broken?
12
13
        Correct.
        All right. I'm going to ask you to look at page 7
14
15
   of 8. Do you recognize that page?
16
        I do.
17
        Do you recognize what's in the top section under the
   "Anus" block?
18
19
        Yes.
20
        What does it indicate was found?
21 A
        It's saying that a white foreign material was noted
22 Circumferentially, which means it was all the way around
   the anus that was -- that's consistent with toilet paper.
23
        Was it your understanding that spit was used to rub
24
   the anus?
```

```
98
                     Jean Cheek - Cross
1
        Yes.
 2
        Based on all the factors, Nurse Cheek, do you have an
 3
   opinion on whether you would expect to find damage based
   on the factors that you just laid out?
 4
 5
        I would -- I would anticipate to find some injuries,
 6
   yes.
 7
        Is there anything in particular that's important to
   you to reach your conclusion about this toilet paper?
8
9
        I would not anticipate to see the toilet paper if
   there was saliva used and the anus was touched and there
   was penetration for five minutes.
11
12
        So in your opinion, it wouldn't have a reason to be
13
   there?
14
        Correct.
15
             MR. GAVIN: No other questions.
             THE COURT: All right. Any cross?
16
17
             MS. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor.
18
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
   BY MS. GILBERT:
19
20
        Good morning, Ms. Cheek.
21
        Good morning.
22
        You would agree that most rapes do not result in
23
   anogenital injuries, correct?
24
        Correct.
        And just now you testified that in assessing whether
```

99 Jean Cheek - Cross you think there might be injuries in a rape, there are 1 2 many different factors, right? 3 Correct. And so one of the factors you talked about was 4 5 lubrication. 6 Correct. 7 According to the victim in this case, there was lubrication, correct? 8 9 Correct. 10 Isn't another factor whether the object penetrating the anus is a solid or hard object other than the penis? 11 12 You mean like an inanimate -- inanimate object? Yes. 13 Sorry. But your understanding, in this case the penetrating 14 15 object was a penis, correct? 16 Correct. 17 So that would mean there would be lower chances of injury as compared with an inanimate object? 18 19 Α Most likely. 20 One factor you didn't talk about is whether someone 21 has previously had anal sex before. 22 Yes. Α 23 That's a factor that would reduce the chances of 24 injury in an anal rape case, correct? It could potentially.

100 Jean Cheek - Cross 1 And you don't know whether Mr. Lemagne has had anal 2 sex before, correct? 3 I do not know. Is another factor how relaxed the victim's sphincter 4 5 was during the rape? 6 It could be, yes. 7 And so you don't know anything about how relaxed the victim's sphincter was during this rape, correct? 8 I don't. 9 10 Isn't another factor the angle of penetration? 11 Yes. And you don't know anything about the angle of 12 13 penetration in this anal rape case? From what -- from what I understand, that he was 14 15 bending over and he was from behind, but as far as specific angles, no. 16 17 You and Mr. Gavin were talking just now about the size of the penis in a rape case, but you're not aware of 18 any studies that have to do with penis size and injury, 19 20 correct? 21 Α Correct. Is it the case that in your practice you typically 22 use an anoscope? 23 24 We do.

 \mathbb{Q} But there was no anoscope used in this exam, correct?

```
101
                   Jean Cheek - Redirect
1
        No.
2
        An anoscope can reveal internal injuries that aren't
 3
   visible on the outside of the body, correct?
 4
        Correct.
 5
        So because an anoscope wasn't used in this case, it's
   possible the victim had internal injuries that weren't
 6
 7
   visible?
        It's possible.
8
9
        And you did not examine the victim in this case,
   correct?
10
11
        I did not.
12
             MS. GILBERT: Thank you, Ms. Cheek.
13
             THE COURT: Any redirect?
             MR. GAVIN: Just a few.
14
15
             Ms. Taylor, can you pull up 3 again? Page 4
16
  of 8.
17
                       REDIRECT EXAMINATION
18
  BY MR. GAVIN:
19
        Ms. Cheek, are you with me on page 4?
20
        I am.
21
        All right. I'm going to refer your attention to the
22 | "anal exam" section. Ms. Gilbert asked you about whether
23
   or not an inmate having sex anally before would affect
24 your findings. Does it have a finding in here about
  the -- whether the sphincter tone was strong or soft?
```

```
102
                   Jean Cheek - Redirect
1
        It states that the sphincter tone was without laxity.
 2
        What does that mean to you?
 3
        That means that the tone was tight and it wasn't
   loose.
 4
 5
             MR. GAVIN: No other questions.
 6
             THE COURT: All right. Ma'am, thank you so much
 7
   for your testimony. You're excused. I would ask you not
   to talk about your testimony with anybody until our trial
8
9
   is over. We appreciate you being here today.
10
             (Witness stood aside.)
11
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, may Mr. Garnett and I
12
   approach?
13
             THE COURT:
                         Yes.
14
             (The following was at the bench:)
15
             MR. GAVIN: Do you want to talk to Mr. Legins
   one last time about his right to testify?
16
17
             THE COURT: No. I think I've covered it.
             MR. GAVIN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.
18
19
             THE COURT: Do you have any reason to believe
20
   he's changed his mind?
21
             MR. GAVIN: No.
22
             MR. GARNETT: I would ask, if we could, just out
23
   of an abundance of caution, just colloquy him again.
             THE COURT: Just hold on one second.
24
25
             Are you resting?
```

```
103
                   Jean Cheek - Redirect
1
             MR. GAVIN:
                         Yes, sir.
2
             THE COURT: I don't want to take the jury out,
3
   and you're -- no rebuttal, right?
 4
             MR. GARNETT: No, sir.
 5
             THE COURT: I want to talk to you. I'm going to
 6
   take the jury out anyhow. So I'll do it one last time.
7
             MR. GAVIN: Okay.
8
             MR. GARNETT: Thank you, Judge.
9
             THE COURT: Okay.
10
             (The following was in open court:)
11
             THE COURT: So Mr. Gavin, do you have any other
12
   evidence?
13
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir. The defense rests.
14
             THE COURT: All right. Does the government have
15
   any rebuttal evidence?
16
             MR. GARNETT: No, sir.
17
             THE COURT: All right. Folks, you have now
  heard all the evidence. I'm going to ask you to step
18
   outside for a few minutes. I need to talk with the
19
20
   lawyers, and then we're going to chart a path forward for
21
   the rest of the day. Okay?
22
             So we're all going to rise for the jury.
23
             We'll have you back in a couple minutes. Okay?
24
             (The jury exited the courtroom.)
25
             THE COURT: You all can have a seat.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

104

```
So, Mr. Legins, do you want to rise again?
   going to ask you for the last time. I just want to make
   sure before we get to closing arguments that you haven't
   changed your mind. Do you still wish not to testify?
             THE DEFENDANT: No, I do not, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: You don't want to testify; is that
   right?
             THE DEFENDANT: I do not want to testify,
   Your Honor.
             THE COURT: And I'll ask you again. Has anybody
   threatened you or made any promises to get you to give up
   that right?
             THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor, they have not.
             THE COURT: It's your own decision; is that
   right?
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. You can have a seat.
             So, folks, here's what I propose. You know,
   we're at -- it's 11:35. Instead of giving them a 2-hour
19
20
   and 10-minute lunch, here's my proposal, but I'll only do
21
   it if you agree.
22
             I want to make sure you do the closings after
23
   lunch because I don't want to break up the closing
  arrangements. I don't think it's fair to either side.
            But what I think I could do, if you want me to,
```

is I could instruct the jury right now and then you could do the closing arguments. And I would -- the only 3 instruction I would repeat is the last instruction about picking a foreman and all that. We would do it twice. 5 I'm told that in Alexandria this is the en voque thing for judges to instruct before the arguments. I haven't had 6 7 that happen in any of my cases before, but I'm willing to do it. 8 9 I'll tell you, the real benefit to this -- and I might start doing this going forward -- is that instead of you -- Ms. Gilbert or Mr. Gavin arguing that you're going 11 to hear the judge instruct this, you can say you've heard 13 the judge instruct this. Then I could do the instructions. Then I'll give them the lunch. We would 14 come back at 1:45. You would do the arguments as we've planned, and then I would just repeat the last 16 17 instruction. 18 So I'll ask the government. Do you have any objection to proceeding in that fashion? 19 20 MR. GARNETT: No objection, Your Honor. That's 21 fine with us. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Gavin, do you agree? 23 No objection. MR. GAVIN: 24 THE COURT: All right. So we changed the instructions last night. Instruction Number 17 was

intentionally -- we just put in intentionally omitted in the table of contents and in the instruction. That was assessing the defendant's credibility. But since he's not testifying, that's no longer relevant.

Was there -- I believe the instructions are appropriate as written. I will -- if you all have any objections, I want -- you know, I asked you yesterday, but I'm going to ask you one last time like I just -- I think I've gone over this three times with Mr. Legins about his right to testify.

The only question I had was there is a 404(b) instruction. But having said that, I think there is a little bit of 404(b) in terms of the evidence about whether or not the defendant had exposed himself before the first incident. And I think — there's an argument whether or not that's intrinsic or not, but I think it would be considered 404(b). So I think we should leave that instruction in. I don't think it hurts anybody to leave it in, but now is your time to tell me if you've got any problems with the instructions.

MR. GARNETT: We have no problem with that,

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Gavin?

MR. GAVIN: Judge, I just noticed this, and I'm not sure if this didn't get there or not, but when we were

talking about inconsistent statements, I had raised an 1 issue before about inconsistent statements made not under 2 3 oath and inconsistent statements under oath. THE COURT: What are we looking at? 4 5 MR. GAVIN: Well, it looks like it's Number 16, and I thought that we had added additional language about 6 7 statements that were made under oath that may be inconsistent, and I don't see that there now. 8 9 MR. GARNETT: It's the final sentence of that instruction, Your Honor. "If an earlier statement was 11 made under oath, then you can also consider the earlier statement as evidence" --12 13 MR. GAVIN: That's fine. THE COURT: So we're all fine? 14 15 MR. GAVIN: Yep. We're good. THE COURT: All right. The other thing is I 16 17 propose to give each member of the jury a copy of the jury 18 instructions so that they can follow along while I'm reading to them. Does the government have any objection? 19 20 MR. GARNETT: No objection, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Defense have any objection? 22 MR. GAVIN: No, sir. 23 THE COURT: All right. So here's what we're going to do. I'm going to ask my law clerk right now to 24 put on each one of the chairs of the jurors a copy of the

1 instructions. 2 You have them all, right? 3 MR. ROSENDAHL: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. While he's distributing the 4 5 jury instructions -- you all have a set, right? 6 All right. I understand, Mr. Gavin, you want to 7 withdraw Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 that were your exhibits? 8 MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir. For the record, those 9 exhibits are no longer necessary because of the Court's ruling on the 413 witnesses. 11 THE COURT: All right. So what we'll do -- so 12 \blacksquare I'll grant your motion to withdraw. I'm going to have -when I'm done instructing the jury, I'm just going to tell 13 them to go eat lunch, not talk about the case yet. But, 14 again, I want you guys to go over exactly -- we've got all the right exhibits going in, okay, and then we'll 17 reconvene at 1:45. Does that sound like a fair plan to 18 everybody? 19 MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: And what I'm going to do is when 21 everybody is -- when she's done with her rebuttal, 22 referring to Ms. Gilbert, I'm going to repeat just the last instruction, which is the rules of the road, and go 23 24 Vover the verdict form then. Okay? So they'll hear that one twice, just so we're all on the same page.

2

3

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

109

```
I also intend to tell them we'll stay as late
   tonight as they want to stay. So if they want to stay
   until 8:00 tonight, we're going to stay until 8:00. Okay?
   They are going to drive the bus once the case is theirs.
   Okay?
             MR. GAVIN: Judge, just for housekeeping, there
  was one additional exhibit that I was going to introduce,
   which was Number 7. Based on the Court's ruling, I no
   longer need to introduce that. So it's just -- it doesn't
  need to be withdrawn because it was never admitted, but
   that's the reason why it's a blank there.
             THE COURT: Okay. Just go over the list.
  want to make sure everything is right going into the jury.
   I don't want to have any drama about this. Okay?
             MR. GAVIN: Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: So just go over it with
   Mr. Rosendahl and Ms. Garner when they go back in, since
  we've got extra time here. You know, essentially,
   everybody is going to have at least an hour and a half.
   Okay.
         Is there -- is there anything else we need to do
21
   before I bring the jury in?
             MR. GARNETT: Not from the government,
   Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right.
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: All right. So, folks, what we're
 2
   going to do is we're going to lock the doors. So if you
 3
   want to leave, you have to leave now because otherwise
   we're going to lock the doors because nobody can go in and
 5
   out while I'm giving the instructions.
             And, Mr. Spivey, do you want to lock the doors
 7
   and then get the jury?
8
             Do you have another Rule 29 motion you want to
9
   bring or not?
10
             MR. GAVIN: Yes, I do, just for the record.
11
             THE COURT: All right. It's denied.
12
   appellate court over here is just making sure I've done
13
   everything right.
14
             MR. GAVIN: Thanks to the appellate court.
15
             THE COURT: All right. We'll bring the jury in.
             All rise.
16
17
             (The jury entered the courtroom.)
18
             THE COURT: All right. Everybody can have a
19
   seat.
20
             Everybody doing okay?
21
             So, folks, you now have all the evidence.
   what I'm going to do now is this. I'm going to give you
   my final instructions to you about what the law is.
23
24 have a hard copy of what those instructions are in front
   of you so that you can follow along with me while I'm
```

giving you these instructions, and then you'll have a copy that you can take with you, take your own copy back into the jury room.

When I'm done with the instructions, we're going to take our lunch break. All right. Now, your food, I understand, is not going to be here until close to 1:00. So you're going to have an extra long lunch break, and the reason for that is this. I don't want to break up the closing arguments of the lawyers. And so we're kind of moving things around just a little bit. So I'm going to give you the instructions, which you need to pay very close attention to. We'll break.

While you're having lunch and just kicking back and relaxing, you can't still talk about the case amongst each other because we're not in deliberation mode. Okay. And that's particularly important because we still have two alternates who although are vital to our mission, when the case finally goes in, they're going to be excused and not participate in deliberations at this time. Okay? So it's important that you all not talk about the case during this extended lunchtime. Does everybody know that?

Okay. Then when we come back, you're going to hear from the government. You'll hear from the defense, and then you'll have rebuttal argument from the government. And then I'll go over the last instruction

for -- I'm going to repeat it, which is really the rules of the road here for your deliberations.

Once I'm done, we'll excuse the two alternates, and then you'll start your deliberations in accord with my instructions. And when you do that, the case becomes yours, and how long you stay, how long you want to deliberate is completely up to you. And if you want to deliberate past 5:00, if you want to deliberate until midnight, we will stay here because you are driving the bus once you start your deliberations. All right?

Now, you'll see on the instructions here that we first have a table of contents that are listed there.

That's really just to aid you in case you have any questions. But now what I'm going to do is I'm going to start reading these instructions to you. I would encourage you to follow along, but most importantly, to listen to what I have to say because this is the law that's going to govern this case in your deliberations when the arguments are over.

* * * * * * *

(The jury instructions were not ordered at this time.)

* * * * * * *

THE COURT: So what we're going to do now is I'm going to excuse you all. Now, I'm going to remind you.

We have two alternatives still with you, who are going to be sitting in there. Hopefully your lunch has arrived by now. I'll tell you what we're going to do is we're going to recess until 2:00 because I'm not sure exactly when your lunch is arriving, and then we'll pick up -- the government will give you the first opening argument, then the defense. Then the government has an opportunity to do a quick rebuttal to respond to what the defense says.

Then I'll go over the rules of the road one more time and then the case will be yours.

I'm saying to you -- because you cannot deliberate yet. It's vitally important. Talk about the weather. Talk about whatever you want. I don't care what you want to talk about. Just don't talk about this case. Okay? Because when the argument is done, I'm going to then excuse the two alternates, but I'm going to give them instructions in case somebody -- you know, I don't know how long you're going to deliberate. What if you don't finish today and you want to come back tomorrow and suddenly 1 of the 12 become sick. I then have to contact the alternates and bring the alternates back. I mean, this is flu season, right. You might have heard that. Everybody is sick, right. So it's very important that you

```
listen to my rules of the road because we don't know
   what's going to happen yet, right. So I want you to go
   back and enjoy your lunch, and at 2:00, then, we're going
3
   to reconvene and we are going to hear the arguments of
 5
   counsel. Okay?
 6
             All right. All rise for the jury.
 7
             (The jury exited the courtroom.)
8
             THE COURT: All right. You can be seated.
9
             I'll just ask, does the government have any
10
   exceptions to what I gave to the jury?
11
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Does the defense have any exceptions
12
   to what I gave to the jury?
14
             MR. GAVIN:
                         No, sir.
15
             THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else
  that we need to go over? I want to make sure we have the
17
   exhibits under control. So just to be clear, what we're
  going to give the jury. We're going to give the jury the
18
   jury instructions, the verdict form, the indictment, the
19
20
  stipulations, the exhibit lists by each side, including
21
   the redacted list of the government's, all the exhibits.
22
  Anything else?
23
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Mr. Gavin?
24
25
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: All right. All right. Is there
 2
   anything else that we need to do?
 3
             I just want to say one additional thing to
   Ms. Gilbert. Your colleague, Mr. Garnett, in his opening
 4
 5
   statement, described his argument as the difference
   between two accounts. Do you recall that?
 6
 7
             MS. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor.
8
             THE COURT: It made me a little nervous then,
9
   because as you'll recall, the defendant never has a burden
   to testify, right. If you do that -- use that same
11
  nomenclature and you describe two accounts -- I'm not
   saying you need to do this -- just be careful to say about
12
13
   what he said when he was interviewed or before arrest.
                                                            Ι
   don't want there to be any misunderstanding about a
14
15
   defendant's failure to testify.
             I know you're going to be careful, but I'm just
16
17
  making sure -- I just don't want to have any drama on this
18
  point, okay, because that's a pretty big issue. Okay?
19
             MS. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else
21
   we need to do?
22
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
23
             THE COURT: I've got to tell you, this might be
  referred to as the "Garnett method" going forward.
24
   think I might start instructing the jury in future cases.
```

So you might want to tell your colleagues that, in fact, 2 I've named this the "Garnett method." And I think I'm going to use the instructions before closing arguments in 3 the future. You've done so well. You've earned a title 5 on this. 6 MR. GARNETT: I need all the help I can get, 7 Thank you. Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. All right. We're going to 9 stand in recess until 2:00. Okay? 10 (Recess from 12:51 p.m. until 2:02 p.m.) 11 THE COURT: All right. I think what I'm going 12 to do, before the jury comes in -- Officer Spivey, I have 13 to give you an oath here. Do you want to come over here? Raise your right hand. 14 15 Do you swear that you'll take all jurors committed to your charge to the jury room, you shall make 16 17 no communication with the jurors, nor permitting anyone to 18 communicate with the jurors except as specifically authorized by law, and you shall discharge all other 19 20 duties which shall -- which may devolve upon you as 21 bailiff to the best of your skill and power, so help you 22 God? 23 CSO SPIVEY: I do. 24

THE COURT: All right. Here's what we're going to do. We are going to bring the jury out in a second.

```
I'm going to tell them that if they want to stay late
 2
   tonight, they need to let us know by 4:00 because we would
   have to order them food, and we have to do the ordering
 3
   process all over again.
 4
 5
             Is there anything else I need to do before we
 6
   get started?
 7
             MR. GARNETT: Not for the government,
8
   Your Honor.
9
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
10
             THE COURT: All right. All rise for the jury.
11
             We'll bring the jury in.
12
             (The jury entered the courtroom.)
13
             THE COURT: Everybody can take a seat.
14
             Officer Spivey, I'm going to ask you to turn the
15
   lectern around facing the jurors.
             All right. The Court will recognize Ms. Gilbert
16
   for your closing argument. Go ahead.
17
18
             MS. GILBERT: Thank you, Your Honor.
             When the defendant walked through the gates of
19
20
   FCI Petersburg every day, he walked into a world where he
21
   was in charge. Outside, he was just another guy, but
  linside, inside that prison, he was in control. F unit was
  his world, and in his world, he had the power.
23
24
             We give correctional officers power and control
```

over inmates because we count on them to maintain order

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and keep prisoners safe. That's what officers like Officer Farmer and Lieutenant Heather McWilliams do when they go to work every day, but that's not what the defendant did. The defendant abused his power to abuse an inmate for his own sexual gratification. The defendant picked a perfect target, Brandon Lemagne. Someone nearly 200 pounds smaller and half a foot shorter. Someone who was just a prison inmate convicted of fraud who no one would believe. Someone powerless who couldn't just ask for help by going to the authorities because the defendant was the authorities. The defendant used his position to gain his target's trust. He told Mr. Lemagne he knew everything about him. He said he'd look out for him. used his position as an officer to smuggle in cigarettes to give them to his target. Every cigarette was worth a fortune to an inmate like Mr. Lemagne.

And then the defendant started to test

Mr. Lemagne to see what he could get away with. First, it

was sexual comments. Then it was sexual behaviors, and

when he got away with that, he grew even bolder. One

night the defendant cornered Mr. Lemagne alone in an

elevator, shoved him to his knees, slammed his head

against the wall and orally raped him, and then the

defendant sent Mr. Lemagne on his way like nothing had

happened.

That's how confident the defendant was that

Mr. Lemagne wouldn't say anything, and that was how

confident the defendant was that he would get away with

it. The defendant had chosen the right place, an isolated

elevator away from cameras. The defendant had chosen the

right time, after hours when staff were gone for the day.

He made sure there would be no video and no witnesses.

And so when the defendant got away with that, he must have felt untouchable. The next chance he had, he took Mr. Lemagne into a deserted office behind two sets of locked doors where no one could protect him. He used his 370-pound frame to force Mr. Lemagne into a corner of the office, pushed him to his knees, shoved his penis in Mr. Lemagne's mouth, then turned Mr. Lemagne around and anally raped him. The defendant had every reason to think he'd get away with it, just like he had the time before.

His victim had every reason to keep his mouth shut. And just like the last time, the defendant made sure no video and no witnesses. This time the defendant even thought he had gotten rid of the most important evidence, the DNA evidence, by ejaculating into his hand and washing it down the drain.

But once the defendant realized that he was caught, he lost control. He was out of control when he frantically called the lieutenant's office over and over

again while Mr. Lemagne was there reluctantly reporting the assault. He was out of control when he called the medical unit for a bogus reason while Mr. Lemagne was there being examined after he reported the assault. The defendant was out of control when he yelled across the empty, silent compound as Mr. Lemagne was escorted across it, and by the time the defendant asked Officer Farmer to write a false report, he was desperate.

The defendant tried to control the situation when he agreed to sit down with federal agents. He was used to being in charge. And no doubt he believed that as a federal correctional officer he could control his situation and talk his way out of this. So first, the defendant said he didn't do it. But when that didn't get rid of the agents, he had to come up with something else. So he said he had erectile dysfunction.

But then the agents started asking about DNA. So the defendant made up a ridiculous story. He said that the day before, he took an inmate named Brandon Lemagne into an unmonitored hallway for over five minutes. It just so happened he had taken Viagra, but only to have sex with his wife. He had come to work with an erection. And so he left his post and over 100 inmates unattended to relieve himself in a bathroom.

With that absurd story, which is contradicted by

a wealth of evidence which we'll discuss, the defendant was caught. The defendant lost his control of this case when he left his DNA on Brandon Lemagne's anus, his DNA on Brandon Lemagne's shorts, his DNA on Brandon Lemagne's jock strap, his DNA on Brandon Lemagne's sweatshirt. And now with this trial, you have the power to hold the defendant accountable.

The defendant is charged with five federal crimes for raping Mr. Lemagne and lying to federal agents to cover it up. Underlying those crimes are three basic rules. One, it's against the law for an officer to rape an inmate, of course. Two, it's also against the law for an officer to even have sex with an inmate the officer is supposed to be protecting and caring for, of course.

And three, it's against the law to lie to federal agents about doing those things, of course.

Judge Novak has already instructed you about what the laws in this case are, and I'll explain later about how the charges and the evidence line up with the rules that I've just described. But before we get into the law, let's be clear. Most of this case comes down to one question, how do you know that the defendant sexually abused Brandon Lemagne. You know that for four key reasons.

First, DNA. Second, Brandon Lemagne told you

so, and what he told you makes sense and was backed up at every step of the way. Three, the defendant's explanation to federal agents was, on its face, ridiculous, and four, the defendant's bizarre, out-of-control actions after he realized he had been caught for what he did are the actions of someone desperate.

First, DNA. DNA analyst Kara Gregor testified that the DNA found on Mr. Lemagne's jock strap, on his shorts, and on Mr. Lemagne's body, all collected after the attack in the office, was a match for the defendant.

Ms. Gregor testified that her results allowed her to identify the defendant's DNA in every one of those places with the highest level of confidence the FBI laboratory offers.

Here's what that means. Take the anal-rectal swab. The odds are 1 in 29 sextillion that this DNA was not the defendant's. A million has six zeros. A billion has nine zeroes. A sextillion has 21 zeroes. A sextillion is more people than exist on this planet. In other words, the DNA was a match.

Second, you know that the defendant raped Mr. Lemagne because Mr. Lemagne told you so. His account makes sense and is backed up by evidence at every step of the way. Mr. Lemagne told you that the defendant twice took him into a deserted area of the prison. You saw the

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

surveillance footage that showed that that was true. every officer who testified about this told you there's no good reason for an officer to use his power to unlock those doors and take Mr. Lemagne back there at that time of night.

What Mr. Lemagne didn't say is almost as important as what he did say. He didn't get up here and tell you that the defendant was a monster who attacked him out of nowhere. He didn't get up here and deny accepting contraband cigarettes in contravention of prison policy and the law. Instead, he told you that he went along with the defendant's sexual behavior until he couldn't take it anymore. And, in fact, he told you that at first he thought the defendant was his friend. And Mr. Lemagne didn't have a lot of those. Mr. Lemagne was surprised when this officer took an interest in him, said he knew where he was from, even said he knew about Mr. Lemagne's childhood victimization.

Not only that, but the defendant talked about himself to Mr. Lemagne, too, and that led Mr. Lemagne to believe that he trusted the defendant and the defendant trusted him. So when the defendant said he'd look out for him, Mr. Lemagne, as a transgender person who stuck out in 24 a male prison, was grateful. Maybe it would help keep him safe while he served his sentence.

When the defendant started giving Mr. Lemagne cigarettes, he was really grateful because remember, these weren't just cigarettes. These, in prison, are money, and a lot of money. Hundreds and hundreds of dollars. That money bought calls home to mom. That money bought a connection to the outside world. The defendant gave Mr. Lemagne gifts so Mr. Lemagne would like him. But not just that, so Mr. Lemagne would owe him. And not just that, so that the defendant would have something to hold over Mr. Lemagne so that Mr. Lemagne could get in trouble for the very contraband the defendant gave him.

Once the defendant abused his authority to smuggle in those cigarette, he started testing Mr. Lemagne again and again to see what he could get away with. After the comments like, "You look fat in those shorts," the defendant exposed himself to Mr. Lemagne in the corridor. He acted like it was a joke. And when he got away with that, the defendant took it a step further, inviting Mr. Lemagne into an office with the promise of cigarettes, but then the defendant started masturbating, and only the jingle of an officer's keys and the risk of getting caught was enough to snap him out of it.

Mr. Lemagne candidly admitted to you at that point that he thought he could deal with the defendant's harassment. For one thing, it meant cigarettes, and for

2

3

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

another thing, Mr. Lemagne was used to sexual comments and sexual harassment. He never thought the defendant would attack him, and the defendant let him think that. Every time he crossed the line, he walked it back and acted like nothing happened.

And then one night in March of 2018, the defendant lured Mr. Lemagne into an elevator and orally raped him. You saw the surveillance footage that showed them disappearing into an unmonitored, unstaffed area for nearly five minutes. Mr. Lemagne told you that he walked out of that elevator determined to report what the defendant had done to him, but then he thought about it more. When he was trapped in the elevator with the 370-pound defendant, there were no witnesses. There was The defendant made sure of all that. And no camera. Mr. Lemagne thought back to the laundry room incident he had reported where nobody took him seriously. Nobody did anything. And during that incident, there had been other people present. With the defendant choosing the time and the place for the sexual assault, Mr. Lemagne felt powerless.

So his choices were this. He could report it.

No one would believe him. He'd be labeled a snitch, get

thrown in the SHU, and live the rest of his sentence in

fear of retaliation, or he could stay quiet. Maybe now

that the defendant got what he wanted, Mr. Lemagne figured it would stop. And the defendant again let Mr. Lemagne think that. He acted like nothing had happened, and he kept the cigarettes coming with no strings attached.

So in May of 2018 when the defendant finally took Mr. Lemagne into that office where no one could see him struggle and brutally, orally and anally raped him, he was confident he'd get away with it again because the defendant had shut Mr. Lemagne up before.

That was when Mr. Lemagne realized it wasn't going to stop. If he came forward, he would be transferred, and that meant losing everything. Not only his job, not only his partner with whom he hoped to start a new life. A transfer meant that he would end up somewhere where an inmate like him could be passed around like property. It meant losing his safety, but he felt he had no other choice, and he decided to come forward.

Mr. Lemagne has never wavered in this account.

He told you the same facts he told Lieutenant Arrant

minutes after the attack, the same facts to Officer

McLaughlin minutes after, the same facts to the paramedic,

Sarah Ramsey, minutes after that, the same facts to Nurse

Womble.

The medical evidence is also consistent with Mr. Lemagne's account. Nurse Womble told you that most

rape victims do not have anogenital injuries. The expert called by the defense agreed with that. Nurse Womble also told you that sexual assault victims react in all different ways to sexual assault, and the officers who knew Brandon Lemagne and knew his demeanor told you that something was off that night. They testified that the usually cheerful, respectful Brandon was shut down, blank and distraught.

But speaking of demeanor, here's what Brandon Lemagne didn't do. He didn't come into court and sob. And he didn't sob that night either. He wasn't trying to draw attention to himself or exaggerate. He didn't deny to you that he's made mistakes. He admitted to you that he's been convicted of crimes. He admitted to you that he accepted those cigarettes and he wanted them. He even said that he thought the defendant was a good guy at first. If Brandon Lemagne was going to make up a lie about the defendant, it wouldn't be this one.

Now, that takes us to the third reason that you know that the defendant sexually abused Mr. Lemagne.

Because he lied about it to federal agents. I'm going to talk later about the lies that form the basis of the fifth count of the indictment, but for now, let's just talk about a few of the defendant's stories and how the evidence proved that they are false. When the defendant

had to cook up a story for what he was doing with Mr. Lemagne in that part of the prison for well over five minutes, he said he took Mr. Lemagne to the secretary's office to print cop-out forms, and when he couldn't print out any cop-out forms, he obtained cop-out forms later that night from the officer in Fox North. Then he said he went back to the unit secretary's office to use the bathroom, but left after he saw another officer in there with an inmate shredding papers. But you know that those claims aren't true.

First, you heard from IT expert Darryl Strausser that not a single person, not the defendant, not anybody tried to log on to that computer that night. Second, you heard from Officer Farmer's mouth. The defendant never asked him for cop-out forms or any other forms that night.

Third, you saw the surveillance footage. The defendant didn't run in, see somebody in the office and run out. He was gone for 70 seconds. And not only that, but the only other officer in F unit, Officer Farmer, testified that he's never taken an inmate alone into the unit secretary's office after hours when the staff aren't there. Not on that night. He wasn't shredding papers back there. He's never done that.

Even the defendant can't keep his story straight. Consider how his explanation evolved over the

course of his interview with federal agents. First, it wasn't me. Simple. Then it was erectile dysfunction. A little bit more complicated. And then it became the very complicated account that I described earlier. And that only happened after the agents asked what if there was DNA. That's when he panicked. Because remember, he thought he got rid of that. He thought that by ejaculating outside of the victim's body and washing the evidence away, that nobody would find the DNA. So he had to make up a new story to explain out the unexplainable, how his DNA ended up inside the victim's clothing and on his body.

The defendant started rambling on, telling federal agents about how he took Viagra and how he was going to have sex with his wife, but she was menstruating so he went to work with an erection and to take care of the erection, he went into an officer's bathroom and masturbated at work. That is absurd.

But it got worse. The next day when the defendant talked to Officer Parker, the story changed again, and he added a detail. This time he said that later he saw Brandon Lemagne and another inmate unattended in that bathroom.

So let's get this straight. The defendant saw the person that he says falsely accused him in exactly the

same place the crime occurred and he forgot to tell the FBI and OIG about it? I don't think so.

It's not just that the defendant can't keep his story straight. It's that his story, in any of the many versions he's told it, does not make any sense. First, you know the defendant never masturbated in that bathroom. It's not just weird. It's not just disgusting. It's dangerous. Officers don't leave 100 inmates unattended to masturbate in a prison bathroom.

You know that even if the defendant did masturbate in that bathroom, he wouldn't leave his semen all over the place for the world to see. He wouldn't want to get caught doing that. You know that Mr. Lemagne was never in that bathroom because every officer who testified about this told you there's no way for an inmate to get into that bathroom, which is only for officers, behind three sets of locked doors without an officer.

You know that if Mr. Lemagne had super powers that allowed him to get through all those doors, he could not possibly have known that someone masturbated in that bathroom and left semen out in the open to collect.

You know that even if Mr. Lemagne somehow got into the bathroom and somehow knew that there was semen in there, there's no way he could have known it was the defendant's. And you know that the defendant never saw

Mr. Lemagne or any other inmate unattended in that office. Every officer who testified about this told you when you're a correctional officer, you don't just let inmates wander around unauthorized areas. You yank them out. You discipline them. You write a report. You do something about it. And Lieutenant Heather McWilliams testified that she reviewed the reports, and there wasn't a report like that.

Not one part of the defendant's story makes sense. Officer after officer took the stand and, through their testimony, communicated that to you. You don't have to be a DNA scientist to know that the defendant's story is nonsense. You can rely on your common sense. You know that the defendant's DNA was found in places on and in Mr. Lemagne where it had no good reason to be, and the defendant's DNA got there onto and into Mr. Lemagne on a day when the defendant happened to have taken Mr. Lemagne into an unstaffed, unmonitored office area for long enough to rape him. Mr. Lemagne told you, just like he told correctional staff, that he was raped. The defendant, meanwhile, said he was doing some paperwork. You can use your common sense to know what really happened in that office.

And that brings us to the fourth reason you know that the defendant sexually abused Mr. Lemagne. Compare

Mr. Lemagne's behavior after the attack with the defendant's behavior. While Mr. Lemagne was cooperating with every official, standing naked in front of correctional officers on butcher paper, being poked and prodded by nurses, and then being shipped out, scared and alone thinking about everything he had just given up, what was the defendant up to? Panicking. He tried to think of everything. He figured there was no way Mr. Lemagne would report the assault. But at some point he saw the taped-off office, and he lost control.

Officer after officer told you there was nothing normal about the defendant's behavior after the May assault. First, he frantically called and radioed all over the facility. Wherever Mr. Lemagne went, calls by the defendant followed. Officer McLaughlin told you that the defendant called the lieutenant's office asking about an inmate that didn't even exist at Petersburg.

Lieutenant Arrant testified that the defendant called the lieutenant's office asking about Mr. Lemagne while Mr. Lemagne was there reporting the rape by the defendant. He told you that was odd.

The defendant called Officer Coleman and asked if Mr. Lemagne was back in the defendant's own housing unit, and Officer Coleman told you he's never gotten a call like that.

Then the defendant approached Officer Farmer three times to say things like, "I just escorted him. I hope they don't be tripping." If he didn't do anything wrong, what was he so worried about? Officer Farmer told you that wasn't normal behavior and it troubled him.

The defendant called the medical unit supposedly for Advil while Mr. Lemagne stood there listening to his attacker linger on the line.

And just to pause for a moment, the defendant told the FBI the reason he called the medical unit was because his lieutenant told him to call the medical unit for aspirin, but the lieutenant he says did that wasn't even working that day.

Finally, the yelling. Brandon Lemagne -- and I'm sorry. Wasn't even working that night.

Finally, the yelling. Brandon Lemagne, Officer McLaughlin and Officer Coleman all heard yelling across the compound yard. You've seen pictures of FCI Petersburg. You heard Lieutenant Heather McWilliams testify that going to work there every day is like going to work at Walmart. It's a professional place where people aren't just yelling across the compound yard, particularly at that time of night, particularly when there's not an inmate move. That's what other correctional officers thought of the defendant's actions.

But the strange behavior didn't end there.

A couple days after the incident, the defendant approached Officer Farmer and asked him to write a statement about that night. And not just any statement, but a statement that is, at best, misleading. The statement was to say that the defendant had been in the hallway with Mr. Lemagne for only a short time, but Officer Farmer didn't know how long they had been in the hallway. You saw the diagrams. The hallway has doors on both ends. Officer Farmer saw the defendant come out, but he didn't see him come in.

Then the defendant also wanted Officer Farmer to say that Officer Farmer had taken inmates alone into that office area at that time of night. But that wasn't true, and Officer Farmer wasn't going to say that it was.

Someone who's in trouble asks another person to write a fake report and asks them to lie when he's done something wrong.

The simplest explanation is the right one. The evidence in this case points one direction, away from the defendant's implausible, ever-changing story and straight to this. The defendant sexually abused Brandon Lemagne, and he lied to try to cover it up.

You know what happened in this case because you heard the evidence. The evidence backs up Mr. Lemagne and

proves that the defendant was lying and proves the charges.

We're going to talk now about the law that

Judge Novak already instructed you on and how that

evidence supports each of the five counts in this case.

The first three counts relate to the defendant's violent

rape of the victim, Brandon Lemagne, in the office in May

of 2018. There are three different counts because the

defendant violated three different laws with that attack.

First, he penetrated Mr. Lemagne's body without his consent. That's Count One.

Second, he used force to do that in the federal prison. That's Count Two.

And three, he violated someone who was in his custody and control. That's Count Three.

The fourth charge is for the time the defendant raped Mr. Lemagne in the elevator in March of 2018.

And the fifth and final count is for lying about all this to law enforcement officers to try to cover it up.

So we'll go count by count. First, the defendant is charged in Count One with violating the United States Constitution by sexually abusing

Mr. Lemagne. That crime has three elements. First, that the defendant acted under color of law. Second, that the

defendant violated Mr. Lemagne's constitutional rights, and third, that the defendant acted willfully. So let's talk through those, starting with the first element that the defendant acted under color of law.

This is an easy one. Judge Novak instructed you that if you find the defendant was a correctional officer and he acted as a correctional officer at the time of the attack, then he acted under color of law.

The second element is that the defendant deprived Mr. Lemagne of a constitutional right. The right in this case is the right not to be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment. Judge Novak told you that sexual abuse of a prison inmate by a correctional officer is cruel and unusual punishment, period. That means that if the defendant forced Mr. Lemagne to have oral sex, anal sex or both, the element is met, and the evidence in this case shows that the defendant did both.

That brings us to the third element,
willfulness. Judge Novak told you that a person acts
willfully if he acts voluntarily and intentionally with
the specific intent to do something that the law forbids.
This was no accident. The defendant was acting very
intentionally when he took Mr. Lemagne into an unstaffed,
unmonitored area, raped Mr. Lemagne, tried to wash away
the evidence and did everything he could to cover it up

afterwards. You don't accidentally rape someone. don't accidentally lie about it to try to get away with it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Judge Novak let you know that if you find the defendant quilty of Count One, you have to do two more First, you have to decide whether the offense things. involved bodily injury, and second, you have to decide whether the offense involved aggravated sexual abuse or attempted aggravated sexual abuse. You'll see from your instructions, and you heard already, that the law holds that pain alone is enough to prove bodily injury. You can use your common sense here, too. Being violently raped is painful. You also heard Mr. Lemagne describe the pain he felt in his anus after the defendant forcibly penetrated him.

You heard Nurse Susan Womble, Lieutenant Heather McWilliams and Paramedic Sarah Ramsey testify that Mr. Lemagne told them the same thing. You also heard Nurse Womble and the defendant's own expert testify that most rape victims do not have anogenital injuries after a rape.

But the United States does not need to prove that Mr. Lemagne had anogenital injuries to satisfy this 24 element of the crime. Pain alone counts as an injury. do bruises. You also heard the victim testify that the

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

defendant's forceful attack in the office caused bruises to Mr. Lemagne's body. And you heard Nurse Ruffin testify that when she examined Mr. Lemagne after he was transferred to FCI Butner, she saw the bruises, too. evidence proves beyond a reasonable doubt that there was bodily injury.

And the next thing that you have to decide is whether the defendant engaged in aggravated sexual abuse during the assault in Count One. Aggravated sexual abuse means knowingly causing another person to engage in a sexual act, such as oral or anal sex, by using force against that person. We talked about that already. You know there was sex because of the DNA. You know there was force because you heard about the manhandling and the bruises. The evidence shows that the defendant is quilty of Count One, and that he caused bodily injury, and that the offense involved aggravated sexual abuse.

Count Two charges the defendant with aggravated sexual abuse and attempted aggravated sexual abuse for the May 2018 office assault. That crime has two elements. First, that the defendant knowingly caused Mr. Lemagne to engage in a sexual act by using force against him or attempted to do so, and second, the offense was committed 24 at a federal prison. In other words, if you find that the defendant pushed, hit, restrained or overcame Mr. Lemagne

in order to penetrate Mr. Lemagne's mouth or anus with his penis and he did all of that in a federal prison, then you may find the defendant guilty.

For all the reasons we just discussed, that's exactly what you should find. You know that the defendant's attack was forceful because Mr. Lemagne told you so. You saw the ripped shirt. You heard about the bruises. You saw the defendant. You saw Mr. Lemagne. You heard that the defendant had nearly 200 pounds and half a foot of height over Mr. Lemagne, and you heard that the defendant used that heft to shove Mr. Lemagne around, push him to the ground, yanked him up, bent him over, and held him in place to rape him. Every push, every pull and every shove was force.

And finally, the parties have stipulated to the second element. That means we all agree that this offense happened at FCI Petersburg, a federal prison.

Now we're at Count Three, which charges the defendant with sexual abuse of a ward for the office attack. Counts Three and Four are easiest because they go back to the rule that I talked about earlier. It's illegal for a correctional officer to have any kind of sex with an inmate. This offense has three elements. The defendant knowingly engaged in a sexual act with Mr. Lemagne or attempted to do so. At the time,

Mr. Lemagne was officially detained at FCI Petersburg, and at the time, the defendant had custodial, supervisory or disciplinary authority over Mr. Lemagne. I'm not going to go over the sexual acts again. They are the same sexual acts that we've been talking about, penetration of Mr. Lemagne's anus and mouth by the defendant's penis in the unit team secretary's office area in May of 2018. The parties have stipulated that Mr. Lemagne was officially detained at FCI Petersburg.

The third element is also simple but crucial.

It's that the defendant, a federal correctional officer, had custodial, supervisory and disciplinary authority over Mr. Lemagne. The defendant had the power. The defendant had the control. He could tell Mr. Lemagne what to do and where to go. He could throw him in the SHU. He could take him to secret places where no one was watching and abuse that power.

One important point here. The evidence shows that the defendant penetrated Mr. Lemagne's mouth and anus, but for the first three counts, you don't have to find that the defendant penetrated both Mr. Lemagne's mouth and anus. So long as you unanimously agree that the defendant penetrated one or the other, that's enough for that part of the offenses.

That takes us to Count Four, which charges the

defendant with sexual abuse of a ward for the March 2018 elevator rape. I won't go over the facts of that attack again because they are unforgettable. Mr. Lemagne described in excruciating detail the defendant's violent oral rape in the elevator. This sexual act is one the defendant committed while Mr. Lemagne was officially incarcerated at FCI Petersburg and under the defendant's authority as a correctional officer.

And, again, the physical evidence, the DNA, shows that what Mr. Lemagne said happened, in fact, happened. In this March assault, as in the May assault, there's the defendant's DNA on the victim's clothing. FBI analyst Kara Gregor testified that she tested the sweatshirt that Mr. Lemagne told you he was wearing during this incident, and once again, to the highest confidence level to which she can testify, found that the defendant's DNA profile matched.

Through his questioning, Mr. Gavin made a big deal of the fact that Mr. Lemagne didn't report this assault right away. But it's not hard to understand. Mr. Lemagne had every reason to stay silent. The first time Mr. Lemagne reported sexual harassment at Petersburg, nothing happened. He had no reason to think that anyone would take it seriously this time, especially when the defendant's actions were so brazened. The defendant

repeatedly exposed himself, left his post to rape

Mr. Lemagne, and walked past other officers like nothing

had happened. To Mr. Lemagne, the defendant seemed

untouchable. And it seems from his actions, the defendant

thought so too. But the government has proven beyond a

reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of this

offense.

We are now at the last count, Count Five.

Count Five charges the defendant with knowingly and willfully making a material false statement to the FBI and OIG. There are four elements to this offense. The first element is that the defendant made a false statement. The defendant told many lies during that interview, but the indictment focuses on two. First, the defendant said that he never engaged in any sexual act with any inmate at any time at FCI Petersburg. The DNA says otherwise. I won't belabor the point, but you know how the DNA got where it did. Inside the victim's jock strap, inside the victim's shorts and on the victim's anus.

Mr. Lemagne and a half dozen federal correctional officers say otherwise. Those officers told you that in their experience, normal officers don't act how the defendant acted. Normal officers don't frantically call around to office after office after a rape has been reported. Normal officers don't shout

across the prison compound yard at an inmate who is reporting a rape. Normal officers don't pressure other officers to write false reports. Normal officers don't tell stories that change from one day to the next that involved Viagra masturbation and inmates simply materializing past three locked doors.

The second lie the indictment describes is that when asked what he was doing with that inmate in that office, the defendant said just conversation and claimed he was using a computer and printer. But, again, the facts you heard in this trial prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant lied to cover up his crimes. The computer records prove that the defendant gave false information to the FBI in a desperate attempt to provide some reason for going into that cameraless office with that inmate at that time of night.

But the computer expert just confirms what you already knew. It wasn't just conversation. It wasn't just paperwork. The defendant took Brandon Lemagne into that office for one reason, to sexually abuse him.

The second element requires that the defendant have known his statement was false and have made it willfully. You heard the defendant's own voice. You heard the federal agents warning him about lying to federal agents and that it was a criminal offense. You

then heard the defendant twist and turn and try to explain away what no one can explain, the presence of his DNA on an inmate's anus. The defendant knew he was lying, knew he was making up a false story, and he told those lies on purpose because he desperately didn't want to get caught.

The third element is that the defendant's statement was made in a matter within the jurisdiction of the executive branch, and the parties have stipulated or agreed to that one.

The final element is that the lie was material. That just means that the lie was important because it could influence this federal criminal investigation. This element is easy. The defendant said he didn't have sex with an inmate so he could get away with raping an inmate. The defendant said he was using a computer to cover up what he was really doing, raping an inmate. That's what this investigation was about. The very goal of the defendant's lie was to make the case go away.

The defendant thought that he could make this case go away, and he thought that he could get away with it because he was used to getting away with it. But he didn't count on two things. He didn't count on Brandon Lemagne coming forward to say what happened to him, and he didn't count on leaving damning evidence of his crimes behind. His DNA on the victim's jock strap, his DNA on

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

23

145

the shorts, on the sweatshirt, and on the victim's anus. You heard Mr. Lemagne's compelling testimony. You saw the surveillance footage. You heard officer after officer stand up and tell you there was nothing normal about the defendant's behavior on that night. And then you heard the defendant's ridiculous lies laid out one after the other.

Now you have the power to follow that evidence and hold the defendant accountable for the abuse of the power he was granted as a federal correctional officer. You have the power to find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gavin.

MR. GAVIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for your patience. This is the last time that I'll get to speak to you. I'm the defendant. We have one last opportunity. They get a chance to rebut whatever I tell you. Please remember that, you know, as we said in the beginning, that whatever I say is not evidence. It's just my spin on the evidence, and I have 21 \(\begin{aligned} \text{an obligation to tell you what a spin on the evidence is \) 22 even if you might find my spin ridiculous. I think what's going to happen here is that you're going to have to rely 24 Ion the fact that you believe Brandon Lemagne was telling the truth at every turn to convict Mr. Legins.

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

In cases like this, I find that when an accusation is made like this, people tend to jump to conclusions. You know, it's a serious allegation. Wow, somebody got raped. And then what the law enforcement do is they try to backfill the allegation. When they have to try to backfill the allegation, that's when people start piling on. When people start piling on, that's when you get three different versions of the same comment that was supposedly made across the courtyard. "Don't believe anything he has to say." "You've got to be kidding me." "Where are you going?" Those three versions came from three different people from the same conversation that was 80 yards away which everybody had the same opportunity to hear, and when there's no camera footage that says that Mr. Legins even went out the exit door and there's no explanation for why they don't have footage to show that Mr. Legins even went out the exit door to make those comments.

When people start backfilling, they start thinking about, well, what's demeanor like. So that's when you get "he's blank." How many times did you hear "blank"? Do you think that these defendants' testimony was all that it was blank or maybe -- maybe that was, you know, a common theme that was shared.

What do you think when somebody says, well, he

was sad or he was quiet? I mean, that's all backfilling. It's backfilling to support the original allegation versus looking at the facts to reach the conclusion. That's why I say to you that the United States has put you guys in a very difficult spot. And the reason I say that is because they basically elicited a lot of testimony from Mr. Lemagne that was far beyond just facts. It was how were you treated in prison, what's your life like as an LBGTI person, how are you perceived in there, do you have to worry about your protection, have you lost your soulmate, things like that. Emotion. They infused emotion into this questioning to the point where when I went home Friday afternoon, I said those jury members are going to have to convict him because if they don't, they are going to feel guilty.

It's not your job to figure out whether or not Mr. Lemagne is a victim in jail. It's not your job to find out whether or not he has friends. It is not your job to find out whether he lost his soulmate. It is your job to find the truth. In these walls, we seek the truth. This is not a district court. It's not a traffic court. The United States has to prove their case.

So what do you do? You've got to look at

Mr. Lemagne's version, and then you've got to look and see

what backs it up. So I'm going to rely on my notes a

little, but I think what you have to do is put

Mr. Lemagne's version in one box and then figure out

whether or not it's supported by another box. And I would

almost note that because there's going to be emotion

involved in your decision, if you believe any of these

arguments, you should not be bullied by another juror

member. You should stand strong in your beliefs. It's

going to be possible that there will be disagreements, and
you should stand strong in your beliefs if you have one.

The first thing. The United States indicated that Mr. Legins lured Mr. Lemagne in with cigarettes. You don't have one shred of evidence for that other than Mr. Lemagne. Not one. No camera footage. No nothing. No testimony of an infraction. No testimony of a write-up. You have nothing.

The next thing. Mr. Lemagne said that the first event took place when Mr. Legins exposed himself in the C-South corridor on February 17th, 2019(sic). Mr. Legins didn't work in the C-South corridor on 2/17/19(sic). You heard that from Mr. Mikionis looking directly at the work schedule.

The next thing he said is I know it's that date because my roommate ordered cleats from the commissary on that date. You don't have any evidence that Mr. Lemagne's roommate ordered cleats from the commissary on that date.

Next thing. The second time. The second time he says -- alleges happened in the compound office where Mr. Legins supposedly masturbated in front of him while just the two of them were there. Well, if you remember, Lieutenant McWilliams said to you that that compound office is always manned by at least two people. It's not possible that Mr. Legins and him would have been in there by himself with Mr. Lemagne masturbating in a compound office manned by two people. You saw the size of the office and what it is.

Again, officers say camera footage. Entrance, exit. They've got it. Camera footage. Entire compound. They've got it. Where is it? You want to say that he went in there. Where is it? There's no explanation for why you don't have that. We're relying exclusively on Mr. Lemagne's testimony. No confirmation at all.

March 16th. March 16th you have the allegation that they went into the elevator and that my client forcefully ejaculated all over the defendant, his paperwork, everything around there. You have no DNA to confirm that. You have nothing to confirm that. What you do have is Mr. Lemagne walking out as if nothing had happened with his folders in hand. They were inspected by Officer Farmer. He saw nothing, as you saw here.

But most importantly, the day where the

prosecutors say that he was violently raped in his face, he had no demeanor change at all. So how can one have a blank demeanor on May 10th when they were raped, but have no demeanor at all change on March 16th when he was violently raped? There's a question there.

He says he went back because he felt so badly or angry that he wanted to make sure that Mr. Legins wouldn't get away with it, and he took a paper towel and he wiped up the semen. But he never could explain what happened to the paper towel. It made no sense. That's the best piece of evidence he could have had ever. So he locked away the sweatshirt, but he has no accountability for the paper towel. I suggest that there may be another explanation for that.

Regardless, after that, he goes on his way. He doesn't report anything. He doesn't know anything. He doesn't know when he's going to be back. But then he gets there again on May 10th. And on May 10th they entered the locked door on one side. They exited the locked door on the other side. The entire time, from opening to opening, was 5 minutes and 13 seconds.

You heard evidence that we did a time trial with just point A to point B closing doors, locking doors, cutting the timer off. That time trial alone cut 70 seconds out. Seventy seconds away from the five thirteen.

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

That means that everything that Mr. Lemagne swears happened under oath took place in 4 minutes and 43 That means that they had to go from the interior door to the office door, unlock that door, go in that door, relock that door, have a struggle as they went back across the room to the back room, had oral sex for a period of time, got dressed -- got undressed, got raped by being bent over. Mr. Legins then went to the bathroom, washed his hands, flushed the toilet, returned to that area, told him to clean up. He did clean up.

They then had to go back to the door, unlock the door, go to the other side, relock the office door, walk down the hall, open that door, relock it. Four minutes and 43 seconds. I'd ask you, in the jury room, to figure out how much time it just takes you to go into the bathroom and wash your hands. I guarantee you it would probably be at least 30 seconds. It's virtually impossible for him to -- to have happened what he says happened. And if you go beyond that, where is the support for it?

You know, it's one thing to say that anogenital 22 Irapes don't always produce injury, but it's another thing entirely when you have a fact pattern like this fact 24 pattern. In this fact pattern, you have a gentleman who has a 7-inch penis at erection. According to the

defendant(sic), there was a forceful rape for five minutes. That's under oath by his affidavit, five minutes. That period alone is longer than the time they were in there the entire time. Five minutes forcefully with only spit as a lubricant. He indicates that he takes his spit and rubs his anus before he does it. There's no support for that at all in the medical record.

In the medical record, there is not one evidence of one cell being torn. Not much less one tear. Not much less one bruise. Not swelling. They did a microscopic review of this gentlemen's person, and they did not find one torn cell. A tiny little cell. Nothing.

So then my expert says, hey, something jumps off the page at me here. And I said, What's that? If he has rubbed his thumb or whatever -- finger -- with spit on this gentleman's anus and then has raped him violently for five minutes with a 7-inch penis, there is no way there's going to be toilet paper there. It's either going to be in, out or gone.

So then you say, huh, well, how do you explain that? She said, well, that is up to you. And it is up to you, but I'm suggesting to you that it establishes that Mr. Lemagne's version is not necessarily accurate.

So if you look at that, then you go to what about the DNA. The United States sort of took great

lengths to say semen was indicated, as if it was a conclusory result. I think we pretty well established that it's not a conclusory result. So this DNA is different than semen, and the semen was not discovered anywhere. So we're not disputing at this point that his DNA was there. The question is how it got there.

So what I'd like for you to consider is a hypothetical that doesn't necessarily involve you totally relying on Mr. Lemagne's version but another possible version. And it may be that Mr. Legins wasn't entirely truthful because he was embarrassed in front of God and his wife. I'm not sure. But based on the evidence -- and I'm allowed to comment on the evidence -- it's a possibility, and I want you to hear it.

So let's say that what these other witnesses -Mr. Erogbogbo and Mr. Fornash -- says is possible, what if
that's correct, and what if Mr. Lemagne did, in fact, have
an idea to essentially set up an officer for monetary
value? It wouldn't be unusual. He has seven convictions
in the last nine years. The conviction he's in now
involves multiple frauds on multiple victims over the
course of a year. That's what he does.

So let's just assume that he has this idea in his mind that he'd like to do that. And maybe in exchange for cigarettes or something else, he goes into the

elevator or to that corridor with Officer Legins and he says, Hey, Officer Legins, let me pay you back. He gives him a hand job. Masturbates him with the hand. Whatever. Suppose that in that, in that elevator, he catches the semen on a paper towel like he says. Suppose he goes back and says that is my ticket. It's not a problem. That's why I'm not going to report it, because that's my ticket.

So if you remember, after that, he said at that point I went back and generated the other documents. I generated the other documents for 2/17 and 2/19 to help me with my story. So let's assume he just basically then does exactly what Mr. Erogbogbo says he did; he went and started researching. He went and started researching with his assistant. He started looking at research on fraud. He started looking at research on how to set officers up for monetary gain, for settlements. He looked for settlements, printed stuff off.

The United States says Mr. Erogbogbo was incredible. I found him to be totally credible. I found that he wanted to come forward and tell his story just because he felt like he had a civil duty to do it.

What's important about that is that for whatever reason, Mr. Lemagne acted like he didn't even know Mr. Erogbogbo. He certainly didn't say anything about a sexual relationship. He acted like he was just an

acquaintance, that you should totally disbelieve, you should not even consider Mr. Erogbogbo's story because maybe I know what's coming.

Mr. Fornash. No ax to grind. He says a week before this happened, we were talking about it. Hey, we're going to find a way to set up the officer, make some money or get out earlier.

So let's move forward. Hey, May 10th. We have an opportunity. Let's go in there. I'll offer Legins the same thing. Let me give him a hand job. Why not. Four minutes, five minutes. That might fit the time. Says he gets that, and then he says, all right, I got what I need. I'm out of here.

And if it's part of his plan, why would he look like he's happy? Why wouldn't he look like he's blank?

Why wouldn't he want to deceive the officers or everyone else as to what's happening?

So let's move forward from there. Where does he go then? He goes to medical. What does he tell medical? He told medical, Ms. Ramsey, that he ejaculated inside me. Came inside me. Not in my hand. Inside me.

So they tell him, well, if that's the case, you're going to have to go to the hospital and get a rape kit. So he says in his mind, well, there's nearly nothing inside me. So let me change the story a little bit under

oath to say that he pulled out and he came in his own hand when he exhaled, but there also might be a little bit in my right hand. He never explained how in the world that anything could end up in his right hand.

So you go from there, and he goes to the hospital. There's nothing found. Nothing at all. But there's one thing that the government did not test.

Ms. Taylor, could you pull up 12-A?

Ladies and gentlemen, this was introduced as 12-A, and as I remember, I had a conversation with their expert about the fact that all these items were jointly put together in a bag and that a couple of them -- the lip balm and the paper towels that weren't recovered -- that were recovered from the shorts -- were not tested.

That's it. Right there. Paper towels, the tissue, recovered from his shorts right after the incident. You want to know how his DNA got there? There it is. I asked them if they tested it. They didn't test it.

It's right there. Nobody seems to think that.

Nobody seems to wonder how toilet paper could have appeared on Mr. Lemagne's anus despite having been forcefully raped by a man with a 7-inch penis for five minutes. It's right there. If Mr. Lemagne is trying to set up the defendant, it's right there, and it's not even

tested.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So ask yourself when you go back, does this make sense? Because if it doesn't make sense that there's no injury when you heard that there should have been injury, ask yourself if there's DNA there but there's evidence right here, they had tissue paper that wasn't tested in his shorts, is he guilty?

If you have a question about the evidence and whether or not the truth has been established, he's not guilty. If it doesn't make sense to you, whether you'd like my version or whether you think there might be another version, he's not guilty. If you don't think that he actually had sex with this man, whether in his mouth or whether by the anal penetration, he's not guilty. If you don't think that, he didn't lie.

There's no other evidence that their DNA examiner produced to you other than things that were directly controlled by Brandon Lemagne. Not one piece of evidence on the floor. Not one piece of the evidence on the wall. Not one piece of evidence anywhere else other than the documents -- or other than the clothing articles that were controlled directly by Brandon Lemagne. Shirt, shorts, jock strap, sweatshirt and the portion that was on 24 his rectum, which could have just as easily been put there by Mr. Lemagne himself with a piece of toilet paper.

established in expert testimony that you can transfer DNA with as little as a touch. It doesn't take much.

If Mr. Lemagne's objective was to gain favor in a fraud -- fraud case or to gain some type of monetary settlement, that that would be an impossibility. And if that is remotely a possibility, and you don't have to believe everything that Brandon Lemagne says because there may be just another possibility that there's another account, then Mr. Legins is not guilty. Keep an open mind.

It has to be troubling to you that not one single cell of skin was broken in that incident as alleged by Mr. Lemagne. It has to bother you that everything that he says took place just like it was yesterday, just like it was clear as a bell, with emotion in his voice, took place in 4 minutes and 43 seconds. And that's being essentially pretty gracious to the timeline.

Look at yourself when you look at the video if you do that. Ask yourself is that man that's walking through the corridor at a slow, deliberate pace and unlocking the door on the other side, does he look like a person that's getting ready to have a forceful anal penetration of somebody in the office. There's another side to the story. You may never know what it is. I may never know what it is, but they haven't proved their side

of the story. I'm going to ask you to find him not guilty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Jurors, I just want to tell you that during Mr. Gavin's argument, he mentioned that he personally believed one of the witnesses. I'm instructing you that you're to ignore that. Attorneys are not allowed to give their personal opinions about the evidence, and for good reason. They weren't there at the crime, right.

It is up to you and you alone as to whether or Inot you believe a witness, and I'm instructing you to disregard that one comment from Mr. Gavin as we go forward. Okay?

This is what we're going to do. We're going to take a 15-minute break. We're going to then have the rebuttal argument of the government, and then I'm going to give my final comments to you before you then begin deliberating.

As to the two alternates, juror number 2 and juror number 38, I believe -- do you want to raise your Okay. When you go back in the back, I'm going to ask you to write down phone numbers -- we already have those? Okay. I don't have to ask you to do anything. But we want to be able to get in contact with you. I'm 24 going to give you some furtherer instructions when we come back out. Okay.

```
1
             All right. All rise for the jury.
 2
             (The jury exited the courtroom.)
 3
             THE COURT: Is there anything I need to deal
   with?
 4
 5
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. See you at 3:15 p.m.
 6
 7
             (Recess from 3:00 until 3:14 p.m.)
8
             THE COURT: All right. Are we ready to bring
9
   the jury in?
10
             All rise for the jury.
11
             (The jury entered the courtroom.)
12
             THE COURT: Everybody can be seated.
13
             Go ahead.
             MS. GILBERT: Thank you, Your Honor.
14
             We all just heard for the first time a brand-new
15
          Mr. Gavin just wove an intricate prison caper plot
17
   with Brandon Lemagne. Instead of the powerless inmate
  standing naked and afraid on a sheet of butcher paper, now
18
   starring as a criminal mastermind in an elaborate movie.
19
20
             But Brandon Lemagne isn't much of a mastermind.
21 If Mr. Lemagne was going to make up a story, he would have
22 described the defendant as an evil, sadistic guard, not
23
   the cool quard he came to trust and came to consider as
24 his friend. If Mr. Lemagne was trying to fool people, he
  would have reported the rapes in sobbing dramatic fashion
```

just like you see on TV, not the stoic, blank-faced demeanor that the nurses and officers described. If Mr. Lemagne was trying to pull a con, he would have embellished. He would have said the defendant strangled him or threatened him, but he didn't say that. He described the force the defendant used to move him around the office to get him into position to rape him, and at the moment of penetration, there was no force. The force all occurred before that. If Mr. Lemagne was running a scheme, he wouldn't have told some random inmate about it, not in a gossip circle like Mr. Fornash described.

The inmates in this case told you that many inmates are desperate to come forward with information about federal cases so that they can get time off.

Brandon is getting out next month. Excuse me.

Mr. Lemagne is getting out next month. He doesn't get a lower sentence out of this case, but inmates like Fornash and Erogbogbo still have a lot to gain. If you're a mastermind, why tell everybody about your plot?

And if this was a frame job, why not just do it in March after you have that evidence? Why wait? If Mr. Lemagne was trying to put one over, why would he admit facts that weren't flattering to him, that he wanted those contraband cigarettes, that he didn't report the defendant at first and that he thought the defendant was his friend?

Common sense says that if Mr. Lemagne wanted to frame an officer for rape, he would have done a better job.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That's one reason why you know he's telling the truth, but it's not the only reason. Mr. Lemagne had no reason to falsely accuse the defendant of rape and many reasons to stay silent. Think of what he was giving up. He had it good at Petersburg. He had Ronzell Jackson. He had safety. He had one of the few prisons friendly to transgender inmates. And what would he gain? Nothing if no one believed him. He testified he was worried about charges being brought against him for falsely accusing an officer if there wasn't proof of the crimes.

He'd be transferred away to someplace where, best case scenario, he'd be labeled a snitch and face retaliation, and worst case scenario, he'd be victimized The evidence in this case shows that Brandon again. Lemagne had every reason to stay quiet about what the defendant did to him. But Mr. Gavin argues to you that somehow this powerless inmate thought that it would be a good idea to try to come up with a scheme to plant evidence, to frame a quard for rape.

And for what? Money? If this was about money, Brandon Lemagne would have filed a lawsuit by now, two 24 years after the fact, but he hasn't. He candidly and frankly admitted to you that he reached out to

organizations like the ACLU and sought help for treatment for the trauma that he experienced, the kind of help he wasn't getting in prison and that he desperately needed. But he hasn't filed a lawsuit.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

What other reasons would Mr. Lemagne have to fake a rape allegation? Not time off. Unlike Mr. Erogbogbo, who the first words out of his mouth when he sat down with federal authorities are, "What can I get out of this?" There's no evidence that Mr. Lemagne asked for anything or expected anything. He testified that nobody made him any promises for testifying or for reporting what happened to him. That makes sense, too, because his release date is coming up in just a couple of months. Mr. Lemagne had no reason to come up with a story to frame an officer for rape.

Mr. Gavin also argued to you that his client couldn't have raped Mr. Brandon Lemagne because he didn't have enough time. You all sat here in the courtroom not once, but twice while we played that May surveillance video. You saw how long it took. You felt how long it took. You felt that time passing. You've also seen 22 photographs of the unit team area hallway. It's not long. You can time walking around. You can time washing your hands. It's just not that big of an area. It's not that big, but the defendant is. It wouldn't have taken him

long to muscle Mr. Lemagne away from the door, away from the detection to do what he needed to do.

The defendant could move fast when he needed to. He told Mr. Lemagne during the March 2018 elevator rape, "Stop playing. We don't have much time." He meant the longer I'm gone, the more red flags go up. He meant I'm going to do this as fast as I can. He shoved Brandon to the ground, grabbed his face and violently orally raped him. The defendant used force, and the defendant used speed.

At bottom, Mr. Gavin's new theory asks you to imagine that Brandon Lemagne was a powerful criminal mastermind and that all the evidence that appears to be pointing one way in this case is actually pointing the other way to an elaborate conspiracy. But you heard the evidence in this case and the simplest explanation is the right one. The powerless prison inmate was the victim in this case, and you should find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: All right. So, folks, I'm going to go over those final instructions, the last instruction,

Instruction Number 40, basically the job of how you do it.

But before I do that, I want to say something to the alternates. So I'm going to excuse you after we're done doing this. First of all, I want to thank you for

5

6

7

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

your service because it's incredibly important. We all know it's a sacrifice for all the jurors to be here, and we don't know if somebody is going to get sick in the middle of the trial or not, if there's some kind of problems. And without you, you know, we wouldn't be able to function. So I want to thank both of you. But I also want to ask you to do the following, and that's this. ain't over till it's over. Okay? Which means that when you leave here today, I would like you to keep following my instructions about not talking to anybody about it -and I know that's going to be hard because you're going to go back to your family and they're going to say, oh, what happened, right. I need you not to do that. We've got your phone number, and you're going to get a call meaning one of two things. Either we need to reactivate you and bring you in because the deliberations are taking longer and somebody has fallen ill or we're going to tell you you're relieved of your responsibilities not to talk to anybody and you can do whatever you want to do, and we'll tell you what happened. Okay?

But I really need to do that because I don't know how long the jury is going to deliberate, if they're going to decide today, tomorrow or next week, and if, in the intervening time, somebody gets sick, we're going to have to call upon you. Do you all understand that? But

no matter what, I want you to know how thankful I am for your service. That's called being a good American. so you know that. Okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

Now, to everybody else, let's go over this Instruction 40, and I'm going to ad-lib a couple other things here, too, beyond the instruction. The first thing you're supposed to do when you go back there is to elect a foreperson. Okay. That's the first thing you've got to do. All right. And the foreperson's job is to preside over your deliberations and be your spokesperson here in court. All right.

Your verdict, though, at the end must represent the collective judgment of the jury. It must be unanimous. And that's what you need to work towards, okay, where you all are convinced one way or the other about what's going on here.

It is your duty -- and I stress the word "duty" -- as jurors to consult with each other and to deliberate with one another with a view towards reaching an agreement, if you can do so, without violence to your individual judgment. Treat everybody with respect, make 22 sure everybody gets a chance to be heard, and then figure out how you can work together to do this. You're in this together. Do you understand what I'm saying to you?

Each of you must decide the case for yourself,

but you do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow jurors. That's because you all bring different perspectives, right.

That's why it's not one person deciding. It's 12, right.

So you can talk about it amongst yourselves to see, oh, I didn't think about that before or I remember this, right.

That's kind of what you want to do here. All right.

In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own views and to change your opinion if you're convinced it's erroneous. However, do not surrender your honest conviction solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of thereby being able to return a unanimous verdict. I don't want you to say I just want to go home so I'm going to just agree with everybody else. Do you know what I'm saying to you? Do your job. We're counting on you.

As I just said to the alternates, your country doesn't ask you to do too many things when you really think about it. We live in the greatest country in the world. We only ask you -- other than taking your money during tax time, it's really two things, military service and serving as a juror. And I want you to go in there and be proud and do your job that everyone in this room is counting on you to do. That's what your job is here as citizens.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

Remember at all times, you are not partisans. You're like me. We're neutral, right. You're a judge, a judge of the facts of this case. Your sole interest here is to seek the truth from the evidence received during the trial. Your verdict must be based solely upon the evidence and only the evidence that's received in this case. Nothing you've seen or read outside the courtroom, as I've told you ad nauseam, you can not consider that.

Nothing that I've said or done during the course of this trial is intended to suggest what I think. think is what you think. Okay. My verdict is what your verdict is. All right. And I want to be clear about that. So nothing said in these instructions or nothing in -- or any form of the verdict which has been prepared for your convenience should suggest to you what the outcome here should be.

What the verdict shall be is the exclusive duty \blacksquare and the responsibility of the juror -- jury. As I've told you many times, you alone are the sole jurors of the facts. Don't worry about the punishment. That's my job. I told you that before. You just figure out whether or 22 Inot the government has met their burden of proof, whether or not they have proved this defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, here's what you should do. You go back

into the jury room. You select your foreperson. right. You start figuring out what the rules of the road are. I'm going to throw one other thing out to you, and 3 that's this. If you want to stay past 5:00, it's totally 5 up to you. Okay. If you want to leave today at 5 and come back and start tomorrow at 9:00, that's fine, too. 6 7 Okay. But if you want to stay later -- and you should talk amongst this about yourself. One person's 9 inconvenience, that should end the discussion, right. Because you want to be respectful of each other, right. 11 Decide whether or not you want to work past 5.

And the reason I say that, if you looked at my waistline -- see, the reason I wear black is because of my waistline here, right. I'm concerned about food. So if you want us to feed you again, which we're prepared to do, you've got to let us know by 4:00. Okay?

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So what you'll do is you'll communicate simply to Mr. Spivey whether or not you want to stay past 5 tonight. Okay. And whether or not you want food. I mean, they are not mutually exclusive. You could say you want to work later and still not have food, right, and ∥just draw a line in your own mind about how late you're willing to go without the food. But if you want food, 24 you've got to let us know by 4:00 because we've got to get that form into you and you've got to order the best food

1 in Richmond, right. That's what you had for lunch, right. 2 So we've got to figure that out by 4:00. All you do is let Officer Spivey know whether or not you want food. That's all we need to know. I don't want you to say anything else, though. Okay. Certainly don't want you to tell us this is how far along we are. The only question is food. Okay?

3

5

6

7

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

Next after that -- I understand some of you may have some questions about different things. I don't know what they are. I want you to try to work through it 11 yourselves first. Okay. Take the instructions -- pick the jury -- or the foreperson of the jury, work amongst 13 yourselves, look at the instructions because I'm giving you a written copy of the instructions, right. Follow those. Talk about the evidence a little bit and kind of see where you are.

If you have a question, you write it down. You -- and this is the only way to communicate. You write it down. The foreperson writes it down on the piece of 20 paper, signs the piece of paper and gives it to 21 Officer Spivey. That's the only way there should be 22 Voutside communication beyond the 12 of you, and under no circumstances are you to write down what your count is or 24 how far along you are. Do you all understand that? All right.

Now, let's go to the jury form here for a second. I just want to make sure we're on the same page. And whoever is selected as the foreperson, you're going to be in charge of it. So even though you all have a copy attached to the instructions, Ms. Garner is going to give you the official verdict form here that should be in the custody of the foreperson, okay, whoever you select to be the foreperson. Okay. And you just go down the line here.

And the first -- your first question is following my instructions, did the government prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt as to Count One. Okay. If the answer is guilty, you write guilty in that first underline. If the answer is not guilty, you write not guilty.

Now, if it's not guilty, you go straight to

Count Two. But if it's guilty, you've got to answer these
other questions to see if the government proved beyond a
reasonable doubt the three questions there. The first is
about whether the conduct included aggravated sexual
abuse. Yes or no, beyond a reasonable doubt. Did the
defendant's conduct include aggravated sexual abuse. Yes
or no, you know, beyond a reasonable doubt. Everything is
beyond a reasonable doubt here. Okay?

And then did defendant's conduct result in

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

bodily injury. Yes or no. You check those off. Okay? One or the other, okay, depending upon whether you find beyond a reasonable doubt. But you only do that if you first found him quilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Because if you found him not quilty, you don't have to answer A, B and C. Okay?

Then you go to Count Two. Again, did they prove aggravated sexual abuse beyond a reasonable doubt as instructed in the instructions. That's why I want you to use these instructions. That's why I gave them to you. Okay? You write guilty or not guilty. You do the same thing for Count Three and Count Four. Okay.

But then when you get to Count Five, Count Five is similar to Count One. You've got to answer additional questions. That's about which lie if you find him quilty, right. So if you find him guilty -- that the government has proved his quilt beyond a reasonable doubt, you write quilty, and then you have to answer which lie or both did they prove beyond a reasonable doubt. But if they didn't 20 meet their burden and he's not guilty, you just write not guilty, and we end.

And when you've got through all the counts and you're unanimous about your decision, that's when the 24 foreperson signs, dates it, and you let Officer Spivey know, and I bring you back into the courtroom. Is

everybody on the same page? All right.

So this is what we're going to do. You're going to now retire to the jury room. Again, start off with selecting a foreperson, start getting some rules of the road amongst yourselves, and then by 4:00, just let us know what your appetite situation is for later in the day. Again, if you all want to stay until midnight, we will stay until midnight. Okay. You are driving the bus now. Okay? If you want to end at 5:00, we'll end at 5 and you'll come back at 9. Okay?

No matter what, I see you at the end of the day and in the morning, no matter what, just to make sure you're all behaving yourself. Okay. And I don't want you getting lonely. All right.

So with that in mind, everybody is going to rise, and the alternates will be discharged with my undying gratitude, and everyone else is going to start getting to work.

(The jury exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Take the evidence back. What should be going back is the jury instructions, the verdict form, the indictment, the stipulations, exhibit list, and exhibits.

THE CLERK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Good.

```
1
             All right. You all can be seated.
 2
             All right. So I added some things, obviously,
 3
   to the instructions just to make sure they understand
   what's going on. Did you have any exceptions from the
   government?
 5
 6
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
 7
             THE COURT: Any exception from the defense?
 8
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
9
             THE COURT: Okay. So here's what we're going to
10
   do.
11
             Mr. Legins, you are to remain on this floor of
12
   the courthouse. You can stay in the room or you can go to
13
  the restrooms, but you must stay on this floor of the
   courthouse until we have a verdict. Do you understand
14
15
   that?
16
             THE DEFENDANT: I do, Your Honor.
17
             THE COURT: If they don't reach a verdict
  tonight, you can obviously go home with your mother, and
18
   you'll be back here before 9:00, then, tomorrow morning.
19
20
   Do you understand that?
21
             THE DEFENDANT: I do, Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: All right. No drama. We're at the
23
   end.
         No drama.
             THE DEFENDANT: No drama.
24
25
             THE COURT: Okay?
```

Mr. Gavin, you're going to have to stay in the building, then. If you go off this floor, make sure that Ms. Garner can get you on quick notice.

I don't know if the government is going to go to their office here in the building or if you're going to stay here. You can do whatever you want as long as Ms. Garner can get you right away in case there's a question or we've got a verdict or something like that.

Okay?

MR. GARNETT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The last thing I'll tell you, I want to commend both sides for doing a really good job.

You know, Mr. Gavin, you and I go way back. So I expected nothing less than an extremely good job, and on behalf of the Court, I want to thank you for taking this appointment. I hope Mr. Legins knows what a fine lawyer that he received here, and you did nothing less than I expected from my own experiences in the past.

MR. GAVIN: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I also want to commend the government. This is a well-oiled machine. I'm told that this is your first jury trial. Is that true?

MS. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that true for you, Mr. Garnett?

MR. GARNETT: I think this is my third, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh, your third. Oh, okay. Well, look, no matter if it's first, third or tenth, I thought you did a really good job. You ought to be proud of yourselves very much. And, of course, you've got this exceptional paralegal, one of the greatest on the planet. We all know that. So -- but listen, you ought to be proud of yourselves. And even when I was giving you grief, you were doing a great job. There was no hiccups in this case.

And what my grief is I'm giving you -- and I'm going to direct this really more to you, Ms. Gilbert, because I've been in your shoes when you've got to come from the big city and you go out in the field. The United States always take the high ground. Always. That's what the message is here, right.

And that's particularly true in your job. When you're accusing other members of the government of not living up to their standard, you want to make sure you do -- you live up to the standard everybody appreciates. That's my message to you. Just chalk it up as a learning experience.

But you all did exceptional, and you ought to be really proud of yourselves. Okay. So -- and, of course,

```
1
  Mr. Garnett, you had Fort Lee experience. No wonder
 2
   you're a master at this.
 3
             (Recess from 3:35 p.m. until 3:49 p.m.)
             THE COURT: All right. I've received a note
 4
 5
   from the jury. I'm just going to go through it with you.
   There's four parts of it. Number 1, the jury requests a
 6
 7
   whiteboard, dry eraser board, a large pencil or easel for
   us to write on during our deliberations.
8
9
             Can we give them that over there?
10
             THE CLERK: Yes, sir.
11
             CSO SPIVEY: Yes, sir.
12
             THE COURT: So we're going to give them that.
13
  Any objection?
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
14
15
             THE COURT: All right. Number 2 is they don't
  want food. They want to leave at 5:00, which is fine.
17
  What I'm going to do is I'm going to tell them we're going
18
  to reconvene at 5:00 just -- because I'm always going to
   have them report here in the morning and at night so I can
19
20
  remind them of their requirements not to discuss the case
21
  with anybody.
22
             Number 3, their question was do we convene in
23
   the courtroom at 9:30. I'm going to tell them to -- I'll
24 I give them instructions about how they get here at 9:00.
   You all be in place by 9:00. As soon as everybody is
```

```
assembled, I'll come out. So it's not going to be 9:30.
 2
  As soon as I have everybody in place, I'm going to greet
   them and then send them to their deliberations. Okay?
3
             And then lastly, the question is is there a
 4
 5
   formal definition of reasonable doubt? I'm going to
   simply point them to the instructions. Instruction --
 6
 7
  let's see -- Number 9 is the instruction on reasonable
   doubt. I'm not going to even repeat it. I'm going to
8
   tell them just to go back to Number 9, and there's nothing
10
   beyond that that I will ever give them.
11
             Any objection from the government?
12
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor. That's fine.
13
             THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Gavin?
14
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
15
             THE COURT: Okay. All rise. We'll bring in the
16
   jury.
17
             (The jury entered the courtroom.)
18
             THE COURT: All right. Everybody can be seated.
19
             Are we missing -- no. I understand. We're
20
  missing our two alternates.
21
             A JUROR: Oh, sorry. Whoops.
22
             THE COURT: It's okay. It's an optical illusion
23
            All right. I've received a note. First of all,
   for me.
  who is the foreperson?
25
             Okay. Mr. Foreperson, when you send me notes
```

from now on, if you could just sign your name and then date it, or just sign your name and put foreperson on it so I know it came from the foreperson. Okay?

JURY FOREPERSON: Will do.

THE COURT: All right. Now, as I understand it, you have four -- I'm not going to say four questions. are statements, but number 1 is the jury requests a whiteboard or dry eraser board. We're going to give you that over there, and the equipment that you need. If that

JURY FOREPERSON: Okay.

doesn't work, you let us know. Okay?

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

23

24

THE COURT: But we're going to give you what you want.

Number 2 is you don't want any food. You're going to leave at 5:00 today. Is that right? So what we're going to do is every morning and every night -- I don't know how long this is going to last. That's up to you -- we reconvene in the courtroom and you leave in the courtroom because I'm always going to remind you not to be contaminated, right. So at 5:00 today we'll reconvene 21 hearing in the courtroom. I'll tell you to have a good night and tell you, again, to remain free of outside influence.

Number 3 is do we convene in the courtroom? What you're going to do is you're going to do what you've

been doing every morning. You've got to be in the jury assembly room by 9:00. Once they get you up here, assembled, I got everybody in the courtroom -- I'm not going to wait until 9:30 -- I'm going to bring you in and I'm going to get you started as soon as I got everybody in place. So if you're here before 9, all of you guys are here by 9, I get everybody else here, we might even start at 9:00.

So -- and, again, I'm just going to bring you in, ask if you had a good night and say did you remain free of outside influences, because that's the big issue. You already know that by now for me. So everybody understand that? All right.

Lastly, is there a formal definition of reasonable doubt? There is. It's in the jury instructions. It's Jury Instruction Number 9. That's what you are to turn to. I cannot give you any further instruction beyond that. That's it. Okay?

So my only comment of reasonable doubt is what I've already given you in Instruction Number 9, and that's where you should turn to. Okay? All right. We're all satisfied? All right. Get back to work, then. Okay?

All rise for the jury.

(The jury exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: There's a sticker on this side. Do

```
1
   you see that, Tim?
                       There's a blue sticker.
2
             THE CLERK: Yeah. It says "dry eraser only."
3
   They can't use the permanent markers.
             THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
 4
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
 5
 6
             MR. GAVIN:
                         No, sir.
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
8
             (Recess from 3:54 p.m. until 4:58 p.m.)
9
             THE COURT: Do I have anything to address before
10
   I bring the jury in?
11
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
12
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
13
             THE COURT: All right. All rise for the jury.
14
             We can bring the jury in.
15
             (The jury entered the courtroom.)
             THE COURT: All right. Everybody can be seated.
16
17
             All right. Folks, we're going to let you go
  home for the evening. I'm going to remind you again,
18
   you've got to be free of any external influences,
19
20
  particularly during this time period when you're
21
   deliberating. So report tomorrow at the jury assembly
  room by 9, and we'll start promptly thereafter.
23
             I will tell you, I'm told that the clerk's
   office is going to have some kind of menu for you at that
24
   time to take your lunch order so everything is ready for
```

```
So you can just work as hard as possible tomorrow.
1
   you.
   Does that make sense? All right. I'm going to wish you,
   then, a good night, and I'll look forward to seeing you at
 3
   9:00 a.m. tomorrow. And, again, reminder to be free from
 5
   external things. Okay? Thank you.
 6
             All rise for the jury.
 7
             (The jury exited the courtroom.)
8
             THE COURT: All right. Everybody is going to
9
   have to be in place, then, tomorrow by 9:00.
10
             Mr. Legins, then, so you're going to have to be
   in the building no later than 8:45, then, so we can get
11
12
   started. Okay?
13
             THE DEFENDANT: I understand, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. Anything else we need to
14
15
   do?
             MR. GARNETT: No, Your Honor.
16
17
             MR. GAVIN: No, sir.
18
             THE COURT: I look forward to seeing everybody
19
   tomorrow.
20
             (The proceeding adjourned at 5:00 p.m.)
21
                     REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
22
23
        I, Tracy J. Stroh, OCR, RPR, Notary Public in and for
   the Commonwealth of Virginia at large, and whose
24
   commission expires September 30, 2023, Notary Registration
```

Number 7108255, do hereby certify that the pages contained herein accurately reflect the stenographic notes taken by me, to the best of my ability, in the above-styled action.

Given under my hand this 17th day of February 2020.

/s/ Tracy J. Stroh, RPR